



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



. B R
/
. R 3 3

N. S. Strathmeyer

Pittstown Pa.

Handwritten text in a cursive script, possibly a signature or a name, located in the upper middle section of the page.

Handwritten text in a cursive script, possibly a signature or a name, located in the lower middle section of the page.

Reformed church review.
=

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

PUBLISHED BY THE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION OF MARSHALL
COLLEGE.

VOLUME IV.—1852.

NEQUE ENIM QUÆRO INTELLIGERE UT CREDAM, SED CREDO UT INTELLIGAM.—
Anselm.

MERCERSBURG, PA :
P. A. RICE, Printer, "Journal Office."
—
1852.

Ry. - st.
 3d.
 10-14-40
 41649

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page.
EARLY CHRISTIANITY—Third Article.—By J. W. N. - - -	1
ZWINGLI AS A COMMENTATOR.—By J. H. A. B., Easton, Pa. - - -	55
THE RELATION OF MAN TO NATURE.—By T. C. P., Mer- cersburg, Pa. - - - - -	67
FAIRBAIN'S TYPOLOGY. The Typology of Scripture, or the Doctrine of Types, investigated in its principles, and applied to the explanation of the earlier revelations God, considered as preparatory exhibitions of the leading truths of the Gospel. By Rev. Patrick Fair- bairn, Salton. Two vols. in one. Pp. 325 and 324. 8 vo. Philadelphia: Daniels and Smith. 1852. By J. W. N. - - - - -	78
KOSSUTH IN AMERICA. [From Dr. Schaff's Kirchenfrund.] By T. A., Mercersburg, Pa. - - - - -	81
EUREKA. Eureka; or the Universe; A Prose Poem. By Edgar A. Poe. New-York: Geo. P. Putnam. 1848. Pp. 143. By J. C., Chambersburg, Pa. - - - - -	90
THE HEAVENLY RECOGNITION. The Heavenly Recogni- tion, or an Earnest and Scriptural Discussion of the Question, Will we know our friends in Heaven? By Rev. H. Harbaugh, A. M., author of "Heaven, or the Sainted Dead." Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston. 1851. By T. A., Mercersburg, Pa. - - -	92
PROTESTANTISM AND ROMANISM. By S. N. C., Jefferson, Maryland. - - - - -	97
PHILOSOPHY OF PERSECUTION. By J. C., Chambersburg, Pennsylvania. - - - - -	122
THE SYNERGISTIC LAWS OF SPIRITUAL LIFE IN MAN. By N. M. S. - - - - -	145
THE HEIDLEBERG CATECHISM. By J. W. N. - - - - -	155
LATIN PRONUNCIATION. Elements of Latin Pronunciation, for the use of Students in Language, Law, Medicine, Zoology, Botany, and the Sciences generally in which Latin words are used. By S. S. Haldeman, A. M., Prof. of Natural History in the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo and Co. 1851. 12mo. pp. 76. By W. M. N., Mercersburg, Pa. - - - - -	187

	Page.
SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE. (First Part.) By P. S., Mercersburg, Pa. - - - - -	191
A WORD OF EXPLANATION. By J. W. N. - - - - -	202
BOOK NOTICES. - - - - -	206
SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE. (Second Part.) By P. S., Mercersburg, Pa. - - - - -	209
THEOLOGY OF LINGUISTICS. By A. B. C., South Glastenbury, Ct. - - - - -	231
CYPRIAN. (First Article.) By J. W. N. - - - - -	259
STEPHEN, THE FIRST MARTYR. [Translated from Dr. Schaff's Kirchenfreund.] By E. V. G., Tiffin, O. - - - - -	278
DR. BERG'S LAST WORDS. Jehovah-Nissi, Ex. xvii : 15. Farewell Words to the First German Reformed Church, Race Street, Philadelphia. Delivered March 14, 1852. By Joseph F. Berg, D. D. Philadelphia : Lippincott, Grambo & Co. By J. W. N. - - - - -	283
THE DOCTRINE OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, and the Baptistic Question. By Dr. H. Martensen, Prof. of Theol. in the University of Copenhagen. By H. H., Lancaster, Pa. - - - - -	305
PRINCIPLES OF ECCLESIASTICAL UNITY. By * * - - -	322
CYPRIAN. (Second Article.) By J. W. N. - - - - -	335
THE APOSTOLICAL ORIGIN OF INFANT BAPTISM. [From Schaff's "Geschichte der chr. Kirche."] By B. C. W., Baltimore, Md. - - - - -	388
A DEVOUT MINISTRY. By E. V. G., Tiffin, O. - - - - -	399
BOOK NOTICES. By J. W. N. - - - - -	408
NOTICES OF BOOKS. By C., Chambersburg, Pa. - - - - -	410
CYPRIAN. (Third Article.) By J. W. N. - - - - -	417
ZWINGLI AS A COMMENTATOR. By J. H. A. B., Easton, Pa. - - - - -	453
CHRISTIAN BAPTISM AND THE BAPTISTIC QUESTION. Translated from the German of Dr. Martensen. By Rev. H. H., Lancaster, Pa. - - - - -	473
CHURCH SKEPTICISM. By H. - - - - -	486
EVANGELICAL RADICALISM. The Church Member's Manual of Ecclesiastical Principles, Doctrines and Discipline; Presenting a systematic view of the structure, polity, doctrines, and practices of Christian Churches, as taught in the Scriptures. By William Crowell, &c. Boston : Gould & Lincoln. 1852. By J. W. N. - - - - -	508
CYPRIAN. (Fourth and Last Article.) By J. W. N. - - - - -	513
NEANDER AS A CHURCH HISTORIAN. By P. S., Mercersburg Pa. - - - - -	564
CHURCH SKEPTICISM. By E. E. H. - - - - -	578
THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS. By T. A. Mercersburg, Pa. - - - - -	590
THE ANTI-CREED HERESY. By J. W. N. - - - - -	606
CLOSING NOTICE. By J. W. N. - - - - -	620

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1852.

VOL. IV.---NO. I.

EARLY CHRISTIANITY.

Third Article.

To make our discussion properly complete, it is still necessary to bring into view, more particularly than has yet been done, the practical bearings and issues of the whole subject.

1. *Ancient Christianity, and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts for the Times.* By the Author of "Spiritual Despotism." Fourth Edition. London, 1844. 2 vols. 8vo.

2. *Die Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche und ihrer Verfassung.* Ein geschichtlicher Versuch von RICHARD RUTHE, Professor der Theol. &c. Erster Band. Wittenberg, 1837.

3. *The Principle of Protestantism as related to the Present State of the Church.* By PHILIP SCHAFF, Ph. D. Chambersburg, 1845.

4. *What is Church History? A Vindication of the idea of Historical Development.* By PHILIP SCHAFF. Philadelphia, 1846.

5. *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine.* By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN. American Edition, 1846.

6. *Vorlesungen über Katholicismus und Protestantismus.* Von HEINRICH W. J. THIERSCH, Doctor der Philosophie und Theologie, ordentl. Prof. d. Theol. an der Universität Marburg. Erlangen, 1848.

VOL. IV.—NO. I.

It is rather a sorry commentary on the reigning knowledge of ecclesiastical history among us, that the statements made in our first article with regard to the Christianity of the fourth and fifth centuries, should have given rise in certain quarters to so much scandal and offence. We have been represented as betraying the cause of Protestantism, and making huge strides towards Romanism, by the mere fact of venturing such statements themselves; as though they were of either novel or questionable character, or must necessarily and at once imply a full approval of the points which as a matter of simple history they are found to grant and allow. Our positions here are not theological, but purely historical. They relate to a question of outward fact, to be settled in such form by proper testimony. How the fact may suit this or that theory of divinity, is another question altogether; and nothing can well be more childish and absurd, than to think of making this second inquiry the rule and measure of the other. Is our theology then to regulate and decide the meaning of history? Must this last have no voice whatever, save as it can be forced to speak in agreement with the first? Shall facts be concealed or denied, because they fall not in with a given scheme of belief? Ridiculous pretension. It breathes the very spirit, that is ordinarily attributed to the inquisition. We have heard of the case of Galileo; forced to do penance, as the story goes, for teaching that the earth moves round the sun, while the honor of the reigning theology was supposed to require rather, that the sun should be taken to move round the earth. The case before us is precisely of the same tyrannical complexion. Nay it is in some respects worse; for the facts of the Copernican system are by no means so near to us, and so capable of full verification in their own order, as the facts of history with which we are here concerned. The first may always be questioned with some show at least of reason; whereas to question these last is like pretending to call white black or black white.

We refer to what we have said of the religious system of the days of Ambrose and Augustine. "You tell us," exclaims some evangelical inquisitor, doing his best to look calm and mild as well as more than commonly pious, "that Christianity as it stood in the fourth century, and in the first part of the fifth, was something very different from modern Protestantism, and that it bore in truth a very near resemblance in all material points to the later religion of the Roman church."—"That, Sir, is what we have said; and such precisely is our opinion.—" You go so far as to add, that were the fathers who then lived to return to

the world in our time, they would find themselves more at home in the Papal than in the Protestant communion.”—We have not the least doubt of it, Sir, supposing them to return as they were when they died; their first movement would be towards Romanism, and the most we could hope would be that, after some time taken to understand the present state of things, they might be prepared perhaps to pass forward to Protestantism, as after all better and higher ground.—“You hold that these fathers, whom the whole Protestant world is accustomed to venerate and laud as the glory of the ancient church, knew nothing of the view which makes the bible and private judgment the principle of Christianity and the only source and rule of faith, acknowledged the central dignity of the bishop of Rome, believed in baptismal regeneration, the mystery of the real presence, purgatory and prayers for the dead, venerated relics, had full faith in the continuation of miracles, and glorified celibacy, voluntary poverty, and the monastic life, as at once honorable to religion and eminently suited to promote the spiritual welfare of men.”—Certainly, Sir, we do hold all this, and are prepared to furnish any amount of proof for it that may be reasonably required.—“Then you endorse the worst abominations of the Roman system.”—Softly, Sir Inquisitor, not quite so fast; that is not the question in any way under consideration. The matter here to be settled is not what we or you may think of these points. The simple inquiry is, Are the positions true? Whatever may be thought of them theologically, are they *historically* true? They are merely historical positions. They affirm certain facts of history as facts, and in no other way. If the positions in this view are wrong, if it can be shown that the facts were not as they affirm, let us have proof of it, proper historical proof, and we shall consider it a privilege to acknowledge and retract our mistake. But are *you* prepared, Inquisitorial Sir, for this reasonable task? Alas, no. You have never read a page of one of these early fathers; and you have never given any serious attention to the history of the church in this period as it may be studied from other sources; for if you had done so, it would not be possible for you to assume the ridiculous attitude in which you now stand. You have never studied the subject; know nothing about it; and yet here you are, in spite of all such ignorance, pretending to dispose of it in the most dogmatical and wholesale style, without the least regard whatever to actual facts. The Romanizing spirit of the fourth and fifth centuries is too clear, to admit of any sort of question or doubt. You simply expose your own want of everything like true scholarship, on

the field of church history, by imagining that there is any room for controversy in the case of so plain a fact.

Any respectable church historian may be appealed to as a witness in regard to this point. Gieseler, Neander, Mosheim, though not with the same spirit exactly, agree here in the same general representation, so far as the main fact is concerned. Quotations are unnecessary. It is agreed all round, that the prelatical and pontifical system was in full force in this period, that the sacraments were regarded as supernatural mysteries, that purgatory, prayers for the dead, and the worship of saints, were part and parcel of the reigning faith, that celibacy and monasticism were held in the highest honor, that an unbounded veneration for relics everywhere prevailed, and that miracles were received on all sides as events by no means uncommon or incredible in the church. Who indeed can be ignorant of this, who has only read Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire? We may put what construction we please on the facts. We may explain them as we please. But it is perfectly idle to dispute them, or to pretend to set them aside. We might just as well quarrel with the constitution of nature. The fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries were not Puritan nor Protestant. They stood in the bosom of the Catholic system, the very same order of thought that completed itself afterwards in the Roman or Papal church. And their position there was not by accident merely or in a simply external way. It belonged to the very substance of their faith. Their christianity was constructed throughout from this standpoint alone. The strong supposition then of Dr. Newman is not a whit too strong for the actual character of the case. If Ambrose or Athanasius should now revisit the earth, with their old habit of mind, neither of them would be able to feel himself at home in any of our Protestant churches. They would fall in much more readily, for a time at least, with the doctrine and worship of the Catholics. And so on the other hand, neither of them would find the least toleration in any Protestant sect. Anglicans, Low Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists, Baptists, United Brethren, Quakers, and so on to the end of the chapter, would exclude them alike from their communion, or take them in at best as novices and babes requiring to be taught again the first principles of the doctrine of Christ. Let any one appear in New England, at the present time, in the spirit precisely and power of Athanasius, or Chrysostom, or Ambrose, or Augustine, and it is perfectly certain that he would find no countenance or favor in any quarter. Orthodoxy and Unitarianism would join

hands in trying to put him down, as a pestilent fellow bent only on corrupting the faith of the churches. No evangelical sect would think of extending to him the right hand of fellowship. His name would be cast out as evil, he would be regarded as a Papist and an enemy of all true religion, in every direction. Such men as Jovinian and Vigilantius would find far more favor. These were the true Protestants, as Neander styles them, of the fourth century. But for this very reason they appeared wholly out of place in its bosom. The whole tone and temper of the time was against them. They were fairly overwhelmed as rationalistic heretics.¹

We may charge all this, if we choose, to the ignorance and superstition of the age. We may be sorry or angry, as best suits our humor, that the facts of history should come before us in such disagreeable form. It is easy enough also to renounce the authority of the whole Christianity of this period, and to throw ourselves at once back upon the authority of the Bible. The fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries were not infallible; why should we then trouble ourselves with their fancies and ways, when we have the sure word of revelation itself to make us acquainted with all necessary truth? Such ground certainly we have a right to take, if we see proper. Only, in doing so, let us see and know clearly what we are about. Let us not pretend in this way to set aside the fact itself, from the force of which we thus try to make our escape. This is all we are concerned with at present; and this is something entirely independent of any construction that may be put upon it, or of any theological use to which it may be turned, in one direction or in another.

¹ "The most eminent of these worthy opposers of the reigning superstitions was *Jovinian*, an Italian monk, who, towards the conclusion of this century, taught first at Rome, and afterwards at Milan, that all those who kept the vows they made to Christ at their baptism, and lived according to those rules of piety and virtue laid down in the gospel, had an equal title to the rewards of futurity; and that, consequently, those who passed their days in unsociable celibacy, and severe mortifications and fastings, were in no respect more acceptable in the eye of God, than those who lived virtuously in the bonds of marriage, and nourished their bodies with moderation and temperance. These judicious opinions, which many began to adopt, were first condemned by the church of Rome, and afterwards by *Ambrose*, in a council held at Milan in the year 390. The emperor *Honorius* seconded the authoritative proceedings of the bishops by the violence of the secular arm, answered the judicious reasonings of *Jovinian* by the terror of coercive and penal laws, and banished this pretended heretic to the island *Boa*. *Jovinian* published his opinions in a book, against which *Jerome*, in the following century, wrote a most bitter and abusive treatise, which is still extant,"—*Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. Cent. IV. Part II. Chapt. III.*

Make what we may of it, we owe it to truth here to acknowledge and confess the full existence of the fact itself. The Christianity of the fourth and fifth centuries was more Roman Catholic a great deal than Protestant. The best piety of this period, as it meets us in such saints as Athanasius, Chrysostom and Ambrose, is fairly steeped in what would be counted by the common Puritanism of the present time rank heathenish superstition. Let us at all events have honesty enough to own here what is the simple truth. Let us look the fact fairly and steadily in the face, and then *as a fact* we may deal with it as seems best.

We had no idea indeed, that what we have said with regard to this point was likely to be disputed at all, or even to be found particularly startling, in any section at least of Puritan Christianity. We thought it was a matter conceded and granted on all hands, that not only the prelatical system, but all sorts of Romanizing tendencies besides, were in full play as early as the fourth century; and that no account was to be made of this period accordingly, as a source of testimony or evidence for any other form of faith that might be supposed to have prevailed at an earlier day. Puritanism, we thought, had settled it as a fixed maxim, that the seeds of Popery were not only sown, but actively sprouting also and bearing most ugly fruit on all sides, in the fourth and fifth centuries, the time of Ambrose and Augustine; and that *therefore* exactly no stress was to be laid on the voice of any such fathers, wherever it seems to be pitched on the Catholic key and to carry in it a plainly Catholic sound. Nothing is more familiar to us certainly than this line of argument. What Independent is disturbed by the hierarchical ideas, that are everywhere current in the age of Athanasius? What Baptist cares a fig for the usages of "time immemorial," that are brought into view in the controversy between Pelagius and Augustine? What Presbyterian is put out of countenance in the least, by any amount of proof urged against his favorite system, from creeds or liturgies that date from the days of Arius or Nestorius? The ever ready answer to all such authority is, that it is quite too late to be of any significance or force. 'The period is given up as an age of wholesale departure from the truth.'

¹ "We can then admit, with Dr. N., that the Christianity of the fourth century was something 'very different from modern Protestantism'—and very different too from the truth and piety taught in the New Testament. We can readily admit that those fathers, were they now to rise from the dead with the same views they had when they fell asleep, would hardly 'find their home' in any of our Protestant churches. They would still have

The fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, we are told, were all wofully infected with superstition and under the dominion of error. Patristic testimony in any case is not of much account, except as it falls in with what we may take to be the sense of the Bible; but borrowed from the time now mentioned it is worth, on all points here in consideration, the next thing to nothing.

Take in exemplification a single passage from Dr. Miller's Letters on Episcopacy. "In examining the writings of the Fathers," he tells us, "I shall admit only the testimony of those

a hankering after the imaginary virtues of celibacy, and asceticism, and mystical interpretations, and baptism for the remission of original sin, and an insatiate passion for relics, and for the pretended miracles of monkery. We grant that the elements of Romanism were fermenting and growing rank in the ancient Church—the church of the fourth century;—and we also admit in these elements, the development of the great Apostacy predicted by the Apostle.—If men cannot see evidences of the Apostacy, 'the falling away,' in the teaching and monkery and fanaticism of that age, it must be for the want of eyes to see, or power to discriminate between the graceful form of truth and its hideous caricatures; or they must be the victims of a blinding credulity, which regards with reverential awe, every relic of antiquity."—*Christian Observer*, (Philadelphia,) Nov. 1851.

This is curious enough in its connexions. The occasion is Mr. Helffenstein's circular, calling on sister sects to take part with Dr. Berg and himself in their protest against the G. R. Synod, for not choosing to make our first article on *Early Christianity* cause for a process of Lynch law at our capital expense. Our amiable friend, Dr. Converse, so well known for his zeal against the assumptions of the Old School section of Presbyterianism, though too delicate to "intermeddle" with the ecclesiastical difficulties of another body, holds this a fair opportunity and call notwithstanding for stepping forward, in the character at once of both judge and jury, to regulate the affairs of the G. R. church. The body is not competent, it would seem, to act for itself. It has no right to its own historical character. It must be tried by a foreign standard, by Puritanism, by New School Presbyterianism, by "*American Lutheranism*," by all that is unsacramental and unchurchly in the land. And if it abide not *this* test, then all must be wrong. But what is it now that Mr. Helffenstein's circular finds to be so dreadful in the article on *Early Christianity*? Simply this, that it makes the leading elements of Romanism to have been at work in the Nicene church, and denies the existence of any golden period answerable to modern Puritanism after the age of the N. Testament. And yet, what so horriples Mr. H. here is fully granted, in the foregoing extract by the Philadelphia observer itself. With what then does the editor quarrel? Had he read our article with his own eyes? We presume not. And yet he undertakes to deal with it, and with the whole G. R. church besides, in this magisterial way, on the strength of the first wrong impression caught up from the *ex parte* statement of a foiled and passionate appellant, flying to his Editorial Bench for redress! If this be either honorable or honest, there is need in truth that we should go to school again to learn "which be the first principles" of Christian Ethics.

who wrote within the *first two centuries*. Immediately after this period so many corruptions began to creep into the church ; so many of the most respectable Christian writers are known to have been heterodox in their opinions ; so much evidence appears, that even before the commencement of the third century, the Papacy began to exhibit its pretensions ; and such multiplied proofs of wide spreading degeneracy crowd into view, that the testimony of every subsequent writer is to be received with suspicion." This is the only proper Presbyterian view. Presbyterianism *must* take this ground, in order to have any solid bottom whatever. And still more must Congregationalism do so, under every form and shape. The universal voice of the fourth and fifth centuries looks wholly another way. The least that can be said of it is, that it goes in full for the prelatical and high church system at all points ; and Presbyterians and Independents are generally willing to allow that it goes for a great deal more than this system under its common Episcopalian form ; that it goes in fact for many of the leading features of Romanism, and that for Episcopalians therefore as an argument which proves too much it may be said properly to prove nothing.

In this light we find the subject handled indeed, even in the Episcopal church itself, by one of its parties in controversy with the other. The Puseyites, as they are called, and the High-church party in general, have been disposed to build the authority of their system very much on the Nicene period of ecclesiastical antiquity ; taking it for granted, that while it exhibits, with unmistakeable clearness, all the traces of their theory as distinguished from every less churchly scheme, it may be regarded as standing equally clear from the abuses of Romanism, as these come into view along with the growth of the Papacy in later centuries. On the other side however it has been well and ably shown, that there is no room whatever for this last distinction in any such pretended form. In particular, the work entitled "*Ancient Christianity*," by Isaac Taylor, Esq., the author of "*Spiritual Despotism*" and other well known volumes, is wholly devoted to the object of proving that it is a most perfect mistake, to imagine anything like the counterpart of Anglican Protestantism as having existed in the fourth century, and that in truth what are usually considered the worst abuses of Romanism were already fully at work in this period ; nay, that in many respects the form under which they then appeared was decidedly worse altogether, than that which they carried subsequently in the middle ages. So far as the mere question of history goes, no one will pretend to question the competency of Mr. Taylor, as

a truly learned and faithful witness. His testimony is given as the result of a very full and laborious personal examination of the writings of the early fathers themselves, and is supported throughout with a weight of authorities and examples that a man must be rash indeed to think of setting aside. The evidence is absolutely overwhelming, that the Nicene church was in all essential points of one mind and character with the Papal church of later times, and that where any difference is to be found, it was for the most part not in favor of the first, but against it rather, and in favor of this last. Let a few extracts serve here to show the ground taken and triumphantly maintained by this author, on the relation of these older and later schemes of Christianity, viewed thus as a question of simple historical fact and nothing more.

“ Our ears have been so much and so long used to the sound (repeated by Protestant writers, one after another, and without any distinct reference to facts, and probably without any direct knowledge of them,) of the *progressive corruption* of Christianity, and the slow and steady advances of superstition and spiritual tyranny, that we are little prepared to admit a contrary statement, better sustained by evidence, as well as more significant in itself—namely, that, although councils, or the papal authority, from age to age, followed up, embodied and legalized certain opinions, usages, and practices, which had already been long prevalent in an undefined form, it very rarely pushed on far in advance of the feeling and custom of the times; but that, on the contrary, it rather followed in the wake of ancient superstitions, expressing in bulls, decretals, and canons (which were not seldom of a corrective kind) the inherited principles of the ecclesiastical body. Or to state the same general fact, as it is seen from another point of view, it will be found true that, if the sentiment and opinion of the church at different eras be regarded apart from the authorized expressions of the same, there will appear to have been far less of *progression* than we have been taught to suppose; and that, on the contrary, the notions and usages of a later, differ extremely little from those of an earlier age; or that, so far as they do differ, the advantage, in respect of morality and piety, is quite as often on the side of the later as of the earlier ages. If particular points be had in view, it may be affirmed that Popery is a practicable form, and a corrected expression, of the Christianity of the Nicene age.”—*Ancient Christianity, Vol. I. p. 63.*

“ A well-defined and authoritative system (involving elements of evil) is, I think, much to be preferred to an undefined system, involving the very same elements; and I firmly believe that it were, on the whole, better for a community to submit itself, without con-

ditions, to the well-known Tridentine Popery, than to take up the Christianity of Ambrose, Basil, Gregory Nyssen, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine. Personally, I would rather be a Christian after the fashion of Pascal and Arnold, than after that of Cyprian or Cyril; but how much rather after that of our own protestant worthies, who, although entangled by fond notions about the ancient church, were, in heart, and in the main bent of their lives, followers, not of the fathers, but of the apostles!"—*Vol. I. p. 124, 125.*

"In this sense then, and how much soever it may jar with notions that have been generally entertained, and whatever high offence the assertion may give to certain persons, I here distinctly repeat my affirmation that Romanism was a reform, (or if there be any other word of nearly the same meaning, but more agreeable to our ears,) a reform, or a correction of the Nicene church system. In thus reiterating this unacceptable assertion, I am prepared, if required to do so, to defend my ground by copious citations of historical and ecclesiastical evidence; and particularly by an appeal to the writings of the early popes and to the acts of councils. As an inference from this advisedly-made assertion, I am prepared to say, that considered as a question affecting the morals of the people, it were better for us to return without reserve to the church of Rome, (horrid supposition as it is,) than to surrender ourselves to the system which Basil, Ambrose, Chrysostom, the Gregories, and Augustine bequeathed to the nations. Nicene church principles, as now attempted to be put in the room of the principles of the Reformation, if in some points *theologically* better, or less encumbered, than the Popery of the council of Trent, would as I verily believe more quickly and certainly deluge England with fanatical debauchery, than would *such* Romanism as the church of Rome would at this moment, gladly establish among us."—*Vol. II. p. 69, 70.*

"Popery then was a reform of the antecedent church system; inasmuch as it created and employed a force, counteractive of the evils which that system, and which itself too, could not but generate. The great men of the fourth century believed, that the system contained within itself a counteractive power. A few years furnished lamentable evidence of the fallacy of such a belief. The popes snatched at the only alternative—the creating a power *exterior* to the system, and assuming to be independent of it, by virtue of the special authority vested in the successors of Peter. *This* scheme was practicable; and Time has pronounced its eulogium. Terrible as is Popery, it is infinitely less terrible than its own naked substance, apart from its form. If at the present moment there are Popish nations in a moral condition almost as degraded as that into which Christendom at large had sunk in the fifth century, it is because the corrective energies of the papal hierarchy have long been dormant."—*Vol. II. p. 71, 72.*

"I have undertaken to show, by numerous and varied citations, not merely that the doctrine and practice of religious celibacy occupied a prominent place in the theological and ecclesiastical system of the Nicene church, a fact hardly needing to be proved, but that the institute was intimately and inseparably connected with, and that it powerfully affected, every other element of ancient Christianity, whether dogmatic, ethical, ritual, or hierarchical. If, then, such a connexion can be proved to have existed, we must either adopt its notions and usages in this essential particular, or must surrender very much of our veneration for ancient Christianity.

"The fact of the intimate connexion here affirmed is really not less obvious or easily established than that of the mere existence of the institute itself. Modern church writers may, indeed, have thrown the unpleasing subject into the back-ground, and so it may have attracted much less attention than its importance deserves; but we no sooner open the patristic folios than we find it confronting us, on almost every page; and if either the general averment were questioned, or the bearing of the celibate upon every part of ancient Christianity were denied, volumes might be filled with the proofs that attest the one as well as the other. Both these facts must be admitted by all unprejudiced inquirers who shall take the pains to look into the extant remains of Christian antiquity."—*Vol. I. p. 131.*

"Do not the fathers then worship God? do they not adore the Son of God? Assuredly: but when they muster all the forces of their eloquence, when they catch fire, and swell, as if inspired, whenever (I must be permitted to make the allusion, for it is really appropriate,) whenever they take their seat upon the tripod and begin to foam, the subject of the rhapsody is sure to be—'a blessed martyr,' it may be an apostle; or a recently departed 'doctor,' or, 'a virgin confessor;' or it is the relics of such a one, and the miraculous virtues of his sacred dust. If, in turning over these folios, the eye is any where caught by the frequency of interjections, such a page is quite as likely to be found to sparkle and flash with the commendations of the mother of God, or of her companion saints, as with the praises of the Son; and more often does the flood-tide of eloquence swell with the mysterious virtues of the sacraments, than with the power and grace of the Saviour. The Saviour does indeed sit enthroned within the veil of the Christian temple; but what the Christian populace hear most about, is—the temple itself, and its embroideries, and its gildings, and its ministers, and its rites, and the saints that fill its niches. In a word, what was visible, and what was human, stood in front of what is invisible and divine: and when we find a system of blasphemous idolatry fully expanded in the middle ages, this system cannot, in any equity, be spoken of as any thing else than a following out of the adulatory rhapsodies of the great writers and preachers of the Nicene church."—*Vol. I. p. 188.*

“Let not the Protestant reader, who may lately have heard Ambrose named as one of the great three, to whom we are to look for our idea of finished Christianity, let him not be startled at this praying to a saint. Ambrose in the west, as well as Nazianzen, Nyssen, Chrysostom, in the east, and others, too many to name, had convinced himself that no prayers were so well expedited on high, as those which were presented by a saint and martyr already in the skies! In fact, a good choice as to the ‘patrocinium,’ was the main point in the business of prayer. These matters were, however, regulated by a certain propriety and conventional usage,—may we say, etiquette: it was not on every sort of occasion that the Virgin was to be troubled with the wants and wishes of mortals: each saint had, indeed, come to have his department; and each was applied to in his particular line. In connexion with subjects such as this how can one be serious? unless indeed considerations are admitted that agitate the mind with emotions of indignation and disgust.”—*Vol. I. p. 212.*

“It was, however, a consolation to Ambrose, in the loss of his brother, that he had lived to return to Milan, where the sacred dust would be at all times accessib'le, affording to him means of devotion of no ordinary value—‘habeo sepulcrum,’ says he, ‘super quod jaceam, et commendabiliorem Deo futurum esse me credam, quod supra sancti corporis ossa requiescam.’ Ambrose was truly a gainer by the death of his brother; for in place of his mere bodily presence, as a living coadjutor, he had the justifying merits of his bones, and the benefit of his intercession in heaven! Ungracious task indeed is it to adduce these instances of blasphemous superstition, as attaching to a name like that of Ambrose; but what choice is left us when, as now, the Christian community, little suspecting what is implied in the advice, are enjoined to take their faith and practice from the divines of the Nicene age, and from Ambrose, Athanasius, and Basil, especially?”—*Ib.*

“The florid orators, bishops and great divines of the fourth century, we find, one and all, throughout the east, throughout the west, throughout the African church, lauding and lifting to the skies whatever is formal in religion, whatever is external, accessory, ritual, ecclesiastical: it was upon *these* things that they spent their strength; it was these that strung their energies, these that fired their souls. Virginity they put first and foremost; then came maceration of the body, tears, psalm-singing, prostrations on the bare earth, humiliations, alms-giving, expiatory labours and sufferings, the kind offices of the saints in heaven, the wonder-working efficacy of the sacraments, the unutterable powers of the clergy: these were the rife and favoured themes of animated sermons, and of prolix treatises; and such was the style, temper, spirit, and practice of the church, from the banks of the Tigris, to the shores of the Atlantic, and from the Scandinavian morasses, to the burning

sands of the great desert ; such, so far as our extant materials give us any information. And all this was what it should have been ! and this is what now we should be tending toward !"—*Vol. I. p. 265.*

These are strong statements. But so far as historical facts are concerned, they are placed by our author beyond all contradiction. The Nicene Christianity bore no resemblance whatever to Protestantism. It carried in it all the principles of Romanism ; so that this is to be considered in many respects an improvement on the older system, a regulation and correction of its abuses, and not by any means the bringing in of something always progressively worse. The model saint of the period is presented to us in the person of St. Antony, the "Patriarch of Monks." Asceticism is made to be the highest style of piety. The merit of celibacy, the glorification of virginity, veneration for relics, all sorts of miracles, the idea of purgatory, the worship of saints, prayers for the dead, submission to the authority of the church, and faith in the sacraments as truly supernatural mysteries, come everywhere into view as the universal staple of religious thought. All this is so clearly established by the historical monuments which have come down to us from this age, that he who runs may read—unless indeed he choose rather to shut his own eyes. And what are we to think then of those, who are ready to take offence with the declaration of so plain a truth, as though it involved a deadly stab at the whole cause of Protestantism, and were the next thing in fact to a full acknowledgment of the claims of Rome ! Alas for our Protestantism, if it is to stand by the feeble arm of *such* defenders. The noise they make is found to be at last, the proclamation simply of their own shame.

It is simply ridiculous then to make any question about the reigning state of the church in the fourth and fifth centuries, as related to Romanism and Popery. Our representation has not been a whit too strong for the actual truth of the case, but may be considered as falling short of this altogether. It is the merest romance, when such a man as Bishop Wilson, or any other Evangelical Protestant of the present day, allows himself to dream that such men as Ambrose and Augustine were orthodox and pious after his own fashion, that the main elements of their religion were of a truly Protestant cast, and that they were in a great measure free from the ideas which afterwards took full possession of the church under what is called the Roman apostacy. Every imagination of this sort is a perfect illusion. These

fathers, and along with them the entire church of their time, were in all material respects fully committed to the later Roman system; and at some points indeed stood farther off from Evangelical Protestantism than the full grown Popery of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Let this truth then be known and kept in mind. Here at least is a fixed fact in church history, which only the most disgraceful ignorance can pretend to dispute. Let it be made familiar to our thoughts. Nicene Christianity, the system which the fourth century inherited from the third and handed forward to the fifth, was not Protestantism; much less Puritanism; bore no resemblance to this whatever; but in all essential principles and characteristics was nothing more nor less than Romanism itself. The great Athanasius, now in London or New York, would be found worshipping only at Catholic altars. Augustine would not be acknowledged by any evangelical sect. Chrysostom would feel the Puritanism of New England more inhospitable and dry than the Egyptian desert.

For his own immediate and main object then, the argument of Mr. Isaac Taylor, it seems to us, is unanswerably conclusive and overwhelming. Anglicanism builds its pretensions throughout on the position, that antiquity as far down as to the fifth century is in its favor, and at the same time against those features of Romanism which go beyond its measure; that these Roman features came in gradually at a later period, along with the rise of the Papacy, as innovations and corruptions; and that it is possible now to cast them all off as purely outward excrescences or incrustations, and so to find in the Nicene system a true picture of what the church was in the beginning, and the fair pattern at the same time of modern Episcopacy after the Oxford scheme. This whole position, it is perfectly certain, cannot stand. It is historically false. To trust it is only to lean upon a broken reed. There is no such distinction here as it asserts, between the older and later church systems. The Nicene Christianity was in its whole constitution of one order with Romanism. The worst corruptions, as they are usually called, of this later system, were all at work in the older system. They are not by any means the inventions and devices of the Papacy, as distinguished from the supposed Patriarchal or Episcopal order of more ancient times. The idea of a steadily growing apostacy and defection from such primitive state of the church, under the usurped dominion of Rome, is a purely arbitrary fiction, which the least true study of antiquity must soon scatter to the winds. In many things, the later order was a decided improvement on the order that went before. The Papacy

was a wholesome reformatory and regulative power for the most part, in its relation to what are called Popish abuses and corruptions, rather than the proper fountain itself of these evils. They belonged to the inheritance it received from the Nicene age, the period in which modern Anglicanism now affects to glory as the model and pattern of an uncorrupted Christianity just like its own. All this, we say, Mr. Taylor makes perfectly clear. Puseyism, in his hands, is convicted of miserable pedantry. Its rule is too wide a great deal for its own pretensions. The line it pretends to draw between Nicene Episcopacy and *Popery* for the purpose of marking off a *jure divino* system of church principles to suit itself, is one that exists only in hypothesis and dream, and not at all in true history. Both historically and logically the premises of the fourth century complete themselves in the full Papal system, and under any form short of this are something, not better than such proper conclusion, but in all respects worse.

As far too as an argument may seem to hold in the relation of the church at different times to the reigning moral and social life in the midst of which it appears, the Nicene Christianity has nothing to plead in its own recommendation. It is a most gloomy picture in this view that Mr. Taylor gives us particularly of the fifth century, from Salvian and other writers. All sorts of immorality prevailed throughout the nominally Christian church. Society showed itself rotten to the core. The Goths and Vandals surpassed, in many cases, the morality of those who professed the true religion and participated in its sacraments. It is evident enough too from Chrysostom and others, that the state of things in the fourth century was much the same, the visible church being literally flooded with immorality and vice. Mr. Taylor brings this forward, as an exemplification of the natural and necessary operation of the Nicene theology. This is plainly a false use of the case. It had other causes sufficiently intelligible in the social state of the world at the time. But the fact is one, which on many accounts it is important to understand and hold in mind. Romanism in later times was not embosomed generally in moral associations so bad as those of this older period; and its worst social phases at the present time, as we are accustomed to think of them in connection with such countries as Spain or Italy or Austria, are far less revolting than the life of nominal Christendom in Europe generally, and throughout North Africa, in the days of Augustine. If modern Catholicism may be convicted of being a false religion on this ground, it is certain that the whole Christianity of the Nicene

age is open to like condemnation, and with still greater effect, in precisely the same view.

So much for the Nicene age, according to the judgment of this learned author. But he does not confine his view to this period. His knowledge of the laws of history could not permit him to doubt its organic union with the life of the period that went before; and his actual study of that earlier age has been of a kind to place this reasonable conclusion beyond all question. He confirms in full, accordingly, the general statement we have already made in relation to the Christianity also of the second and third centuries, as tried by the standard of modern Protestantism. The fourth century was a true continuation of the ecclesiastical forms and views of the third; and this again grew, by natural and legitimate birth, out of the bosom of the second. As far back as our historical notices reach, we find no trace this side of the New Testament of any church system at all answering to any Puritan scheme of the present time; no room or space however small in which to locate the hypothesis even of any such scheme; but very sufficient proof rather that the prevailing habit of thought looked all quite another way, and that in principle and tendency at least the infant church was carried from the very start towards the order of the third and fourth centuries, and through this, we may say, towards the medieval Catholicism in which that older system finally became complete. Listen for a moment again to the strong testimony of our English writer.

“At a time not more remote from the Apostolic age than we, of this generation, are from the times of Barrow, Tillotson, Taylor, Baxter, we find every element of the abuses of the twelfth century, and not the elements only, but some of those abuses in a ripened, nay, in a putrescent condition.”—*Vol. I. p. 70.*

“I cannot however proceed to call in my next pair of witnesses, without adverting to a fact which forces itself upon every well informed and reflecting reader of the early Christian writers, I mean the much higher moral condition, and the more effective discipline of the Romish church in later times, than can with any truth be claimed for the ancient church, even during its era of suffering and depression. Our ears are stunned with the outcry against the ‘corruptions of Popery.’ I boldly say that Popery, foul as it is, and has ever been, in the mass, might yet fairly represent itself as a *reform upon early Christianity*. Do not accuse me of the wish to startle you with paradoxes. I will not swell my pages (which will have enough to bear) with quotations from modern books that are in the hands of most religious readers. In truth, volumes of unimpeachable evidence might be produced, establishing the fact, that

the *later* Romish church has had to boast eminent virtues, in connexion with her monastic institutions; and I think virtues, better compacted, and more consistent than belonged to the earlier church."

—"Nothing can be more inequitable than to charge these horrors upon Romanism. The church of Rome has done, in these instances, *the best it could*, to bring the cumbrous abomination bequeathed to it by the saints and doctors and martyrs of the pristine age, into a manageable condition. And if we are to hear much more of the 'corruptions of popery,' as opposed to 'primitive purity,' there will be no alternative but freely to lay open the sewers of the early church, and to allow them to disgorge their contents upon the wholesome air."—"Before we reprobate popes, councils, and Romanist saints, let us fairly see what sort of system it was which the doctors and martyrs of the highest antiquity had delivered into their care and custody. We Protestants are prompt enough to condemn the pontiffs, or St. Bernard; but let inquiry be made concerning the Christianity imbodyed in the writings of those to whom popes and doctors looked up, as their undoubted masters."—*Vol. I. p. 77-79.*

"I have undertaken to adduce proof of the assertion, not only that the doctrine of the merit of celibacy, and the consequent practices, are found in a mature state at an early age; but also—That, at the earliest period at which we find this doctrine, and these practices, distinctly mentioned, they are referred to in such a manner as to make it certain that they were, at that time, no novelties or recent innovations. Now I am aware that a statement such as this, if it shall appear to be borne out by evidence, will excite alarm in some minds; the dissipation of erroneous impressions, is always a critical and somewhat perilous operation; nevertheless dangers much more to be feared, are incurred by a refusal to admit the full and simple truth. Yet the alarm that may be felt in this instance, at the first, may soon be removed; for although it were to appear that certain capital errors of feeling, and practice, had seized the church universal, at the very moment when the personal influence of the apostles was withdrawn, yet such an admission will shake no principle really important to our faith or comfort. In fact, too many have been attaching their faith and comfort to a supposition, concerning pristine Christianity, which is totally illusory, and such as can bear no examination—a supposition which must long ago have been dispelled from all well-informed minds, by the influence of rational modes of dealing with historical materials, if it had not been for the *conservative accident*, that the materials, which belong to this particular department of history, have lain imbedded in repulsive folios of Latin and Greek, to which very few, and those not the most independent, or energetic in their habits of mind, have had access. Certain utterly unfounded generalities, very delight-

ful had they possessed the recommendation of truth, have been a thousand times repeated, and seldom scrutinized.

“ But the times of this ignorance are now passing away : and I think the zeal of the Oxford writers will have the effect, as an indirect means, of disabusing effectively, and for ever, the religious mind, in this country, and perhaps throughout Europe, of the inveterate illusions that have so long hung over the fields of Christian antiquity. It will be utterly impossible, much longer to make those things believed which we have been taught to consider as unquestionable ; and the result must be, (how desirable a result) the compelling the Christian church, henceforward, to rest its faith and practice on the only solid foundation.

“ The actual impression, moral and spiritual, made upon the Jewish and Pagan world by the preaching of the Apostles themselves, and of their personal colleagues, has, I fear, been overrated by the generality of Christians.”——“ And then, as to the period immediately following the death of the apostles, and of the men whom they personally appointed to govern the churches, we have too easily, and without any sufficient evidence, assumed the belief that a brightness and purity belonged to it, only a shade or two less than what we have attributed to the apostolic times. This belief, is, in fact, merely the correlative of the common Protestant notion concerning the progressive corruptions of Popery, it being a natural supposition that the higher we ascend toward the apostolic age, so much the more truth, simplicity, purity, must there have been in the church. Thus it is that we have allowed ourselves to theorize, when what we should have done, was simply to examine our documents.

“ The opinion that has forced itself upon my own mind, is to this effect, that the period dating its commencement from the death of the last of the apostles, or apostolic men, was, altogether, as little deserving to be selected and proposed *as a pattern*, as any one of the first five of church history ;—it had indeed its single points of excellence, and of a high order, but by no means shone in those consistent and exemplary qualities which should entitle it to the honour of being considered as a model to after ages. We need therefore neither feel surprise nor alarm, when we find, in particular instances, that the grossest errors of theory and practice, are to be traced to their origin in the first century. In such instances, for my own part, I can wonder at nothing but the infatuation of those who, fully informed as they must be of the actual facts, and benefited moreover by modern modes of thinking, can nevertheless so prostrate their understandings before the phantom—venerable antiquity, as to be inflamed with the desire of inducing the Christian world to imitate what really asks for apology and extenuation.”—*Vol. I. p. 102–104.*

"In fact, I think, there are very few points of difference, distinguishing the Nicene church from either the earlier or the later church, within the compass of two hundred years on either side, which modern controvertists of any class would much care to insist upon, as of material consequence to their particular opinions."—*Vol. I. p. 144.*

These are serious admissions ; and coming from such a source, they are entitled certainly to serious consideration. Let it be borne in mind, that we quote them simply in confirmation of a historical fact, without any regard now to the light in which this fact may be viewed, either by Mr. Taylor himself or by others, in its theological connections. It is of the highest importance, that we should make here a clear distinction, between what actually had place and what construction should be put upon it in a theory of church history. All we are concerned with at present, is the simple fact, (explain it or judge of it as we may,) that the Christianity of the second century was in no sense of one and the same order with modern Puritanism. How far precisely it may have anticipated the several features of the later Nicene system, is not entirely clear ; but that it carried in it the elements and germs of this system, and looked towards it from the first with inward natural tendency, would seem to be beyond all doubt. The third century could not be what we find it to be in Cyprian and the Apostolical Constitutions, without some corresponding preparation at least in the age immediately preceding ; and both the fact of such preparation, and its general nature, can be easily enough traced, as we have already shown, not merely to the time of Tertullian and Irenæus, but away back even to the days also of Polycarp and Ignatius. Let the *fact* then be fairly and honestly acknowledged ; or else let it be disputed and set aside, if possible, on proper historical grounds. We present it as a simple point of history. We might wish it to be otherwise ; but we feel that we have no power to make it otherwise, any more than we have to stop the earth from rolling round the sun, or to hush the alphabet of geology into dead silence. Facts themselves must not be treated as heresies, however we may feel disposed to treat the conclusions which are drawn from them.

But—we hear some one say—our appeal as to what constituted Early Christianity, in its oldest form, is to the New Testament itself. Let the writings of the Apostles themselves speak. The fathers sadly corrupted the truth, and mingled with it the dreams of pagan philosophy. Let those who choose rest in such false

or doubtful authority ; we go at once to the original founders of the church, and are content to learn what it was in the beginning from their lips.

All very good, we say in reply ; all very good. But the point before us just now, is not the Christianity that may be taught in the New Testament, or that may have prevailed in the Apostolical age.¹ Our inquiry, as historical, has been directed throughout to the determination of what Christianity was *after* the age of the Apostles, first in the Nicene age, and then back of that again in the middle and first part of the second century. The facts regarded in these two cases, are by no means just the same ; and our idea of the first must not be allowed to blind or distort our vision, as directed towards this last. You may not care indeed for any later state of the church ; but that is no reason why such later state should not be allowed, as a fact of history at least, to appear in its own place and under its own form. If we do not need it for our faith, let us at all events not quarrel with it as a matter of simple knowledge.

The fact itself however, in whatever light we regard it theologically, is one of the greatest practical account, as necessarily conditioning our whole theory of church history, and more particularly the view we may take of the relation that holds between Catholicism and Protestantism.

We have from it first of all this general result, that Protestantism is not at all identical with early Christianity, in the form at least which it carries after the time of the Apostles. We do not of course urge this as an objection to Protestantism. There are, as we shall see presently, different ways of reconciling the fact with the supposition that it is after all the purest and best style of Christianity. If we except Newman, all the distinguished writers whose works are quoted at the beginning of the present article, have in view the vindication of the Protestant Reformation, over against the pretensions of the Roman church ; and yet all of them agree with Newman himself, in believing the

¹ Those who take us to task for not ascending at once to the original records of Christianity, for the determination of what it was in its earliest and purest form, ought to remember that this whole discussion has had for its object from the beginning an altogether different inquiry—prompted in the first place by a particular position taken in the Rev. Dr. Bacon's Letter from Lyons ; this namely, that the system of religion now prevalent in New England, is to be regarded as in all material points the same with that which existed at Lyons, and throughout the church generally, in the days of Pothinus and Irenæus.

modern form of religion to be in many respects very different from that which prevailed either in the fourth century or in the second. Newman's own theory indeed makes the mere fact of the disagreement to be of no conclusive force; since he himself allows the idea of a real historical movement in the life of the church, and must consider Protestantism therefore to be sufficiently justified on his own principles, if only it can be shown to be a legitimate development out of the bosom of Christianity as this stood before.

The general truth is clear. Protestantism and Early Christianity are not the same. Let it be observed, we speak not now of early Christianity as it may be supposed to have been in the age of the Apostles, but of its manifestation in the period following that age, as far back as our historical notices reach this side of the New Testament. We speak not of what it may have been before the destruction of Jerusalem, or for a short time afterwards, in the first century; but of what it is found to have been, as a fact of history, in the second century as well as in the third and fourth. Let it be observed again also, that we speak now not of inward essence but of outward form. There may be wide differences in the latter view, where a real sameness has place after all under the former view. All we say is, that Protestantism outwardly considered does not agree, in its general constitution and form, with what we find Christianity to have been after the time of the New Testament, as far back as the middle of the second century as well as in the fourth and third. No one of our modern sects can show itself to be identical with this ancient church. They may fall upon the still older period of the New Testament, and claim to be in full agreement with this; to all that we have nothing just now to say; but they are not any of them what the church was in the days either of Athanasius or of Cyprian or of Irenæus. The church from the fourth century back to the first part of the second was not Congregationalism, nor Presbyterianism, nor Methodism, nor Anglican Episcopalianism, nor any other phase of Protestantism as it now stands. It had its own changes great and serious during this period; but through them all it bears a certain sameness of character peculiar to itself, with which none of these modern systems is found to agree. It carries in it from the beginning elements and tendencies, from whatever source derived, that look steadily towards Romanism, the later system in which all at last actually reached their natural end. Protestantism is not the re-pristination simply of any such ecclesiastical antiquity, (this side of the New Testament,) whether under its later or its earlier

form. Its right to exist can never be put safely on any test of this sort.

So much we ought to see and openly confess. Nothing is gained, but much lost rather, by pretending to consider our modern position the same that was occupied by the primitive post-apostolical church. We cannot force facts; and it is always rash and impolitic to take ground directly or indirectly, that makes any such violence necessary for the support of our cause.

Granting then, as all who know anything of church history must, that Protestantism is not the restoration strictly of early (post-apostolical) Christianity, but that this ran naturally rather first into the Nicene system, and then through that again into the later Roman Catholic system, how is the cause of the Reformation to be vindicated as just and right? What view shall we take of this disagreement, (solemn historical fact as it is and not to be disguised nor ignored,) which shall not compromise the credit of Protestantism, but allow us to regard it still as worthy of our confidence and trust? Such is the great question, with the solution of which not a few of the best minds of our age are now seriously wrestling, as a problem of the deepest interest for the world. Only the superficial can fail to look upon it in this light.

Shall we cut the whole matter short, by casting off entirely the authority of the post-apostolical church from the second century down to the sixteenth and by throwing ourselves exclusively on the New Testament, as a sufficient warrant for the modern system, not only without antiquity, but against it also, to any extent that the case may require? This is the ground taken by Puritanism.¹ Its theory is, that Protestantism stands in no or-

¹ It is hardly necessary to say, that Puritanism, as we always take it, is by no means the same thing with Protestantism. It is of later appearance, a sort of *second growth* upon the original work of the Reformation; and its distinctive features in this view are by no means hard to understand. It is one side simply of the original whole of Protestantism, the Reformed tendency; not in polar union as this was at first with the Lutheran tendency, and so in organic connection with the proper historical life of the old Catholic church; but cut off from both these relations, and under such miserable unhistorical and unchurchly abstraction, now claiming pedantically to be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, of all that Christianity has ever been in the world. It resolves all religion into private reason, by making this to be the only oracle of what is to be considered the divine sense of the Bible. It is always in this way rationalistic, even when it may seem to be most orthodox. It has no sense of a supernatural church, no faith in the holy sacraments, no sympathy with the reigning drift and tone of the ancient creed. It makes no account of Catholic Christianity.

ganic historical connection with the life of the Catholic church as we find it before the Reformation; that the relation between the two was one of simple contradiction; that the old church was an entire apostacy from the Christianity of the New Testament; and that this was reproduced in the sixteenth century, as an absolutely new creation, directly from its own original fountain and source. The assumption is, that the church at an early period fell away from its primitive purity, and came under the power of a strange and dreadful apostacy, which completed itself finally in the Papacy and all the abominations usually charged upon the church of Rome. The theory involves the idea of a steadily growing corruption, a continual progress from bad to worse. The fourth century thus is taken to have been far more pure than the twelfth. Still its general corruption also is not to be denied. The third century too must have been strongly set in the same false direction. But is there no part of the second, that may be claimed as the pattern of evangelical piety in its modern Protestant style? This is frequently taken for granted in a quiet way, for the purpose of effect. But we have found the assumption to be groundless. History knows nothing of any such period, after the age of the Apostles, but on the contrary shows the church, from the time it first comes into notice, to have been plainly committed to the course of things that led onward directly to the Nicene system. So this Puritan theory, to be fully true to itself, is willing in the end to give up *all* post-apostolical antiquity. It is enough for it, to be certain that the pattern of Protestantism is found in the New Testament. Grant that a different order of religion is found to be at work immediately afterwards, in the ancient church, to what does the fact amount in the face of this original rule, which the world can now interpret for itself? So far as any such difference goes, we have only to set it down from the first for an apostacy, the coming in of that grand catastrophe which afterwards turned the church into a synagogue of hell. Protestantism sets the whole process aside, overleaps the entire interval between the sixteenth

Anglicanism, in its eyes, is sheer foolery and falsehood. The sense of Lutheranism—*true* Lutheranism, and not the bastard spawn of Puritanism itself usurping this venerable name—it has no power even to comprehend; the whole system is a *terra incognita* to its brain. Even the old Calvinistic or Reformed faith has passed quite beyond its horizon. And yet it now claims to be the whole fact of Protestantism, and as such the whole truth of Christianity! Preposterous assumption. Puritanism is indeed a great fact too in its way; but it is not proper Protestantism. This is something older, wider, greater, and as we believe also a great deal better.

century and the first, abjures antiquity clear back to the beginning, and claims to be a new and fresh copy simply of what Christianity was in the days of the Apostles.

This theory we have examined and found wanting. Its disposition of facts, in the first place, is loose and blind in the extreme. There is no such difference as it pretends, in the order of corruption, between the Popery of the middle ages and the period going before. We agree fully with Mr. Taylor, that this was in many respects an improvement on the older system. Then again, the main hypothesis in the case is in the highest degree unnatural and violent. It assumes a full *principal* failure of the church from the very start, an actual triumph of Satan over Christ in the very heart and bosom of his own kingdom, in the face of all God's promises to the contrary, in the face of the original charter and commission of this same church from Christ's own lips, and in spite of his continual headship over it at the right hand of the Father, with all power given unto him in heaven and in earth, to make good his word that the gates of hell should not prevail against it through all time. For the idea is, that the ancient church *did* fail, so as to lose finally the life with which it started; and that Protestantism therefore is no continuation of this life in any really historical way, but an actual return to the beginning, for the purpose of a new experiment of Christianity under a better and safer form. In this way Protestantism is made to be the contradiction and negation of all previous Christianity, back to the age of the Apostles. Its justification requires us to denounce and condemn all church antiquity. To be on good terms with it, we must renounce everything like hearty fellowship—if not with the names—at least with the real persons of the fathers, martyrs, and saints, of the first centuries, everything like true sympathy with their actual spirit and life. Then farther, the use which the theory makes of the Bible is by no means satisfactory; and is of such a wilful and arbitrary character indeed, as may well inspire a terrible doubt of its being more free from mistake after all than the use made of it by the ancient church. If all antiquity could so blunder here, for fifteen centuries, as to miss the entire sense of God's word, who will go bail for us that Puritanism may be trusted and followed now as a truly infallible guide? Finally, the scheme refuses to come into any sort of intelligible harmony with the course of church history. It supposes such a state of things as leaves no room for the idea of a divine life in the church, and makes it in fact to have been the enemy of all truth and righteousness. And yet the church has never been

without the signs and proofs of Christ's supernatural presence in her midst, (according to his promise,) from the beginning.

Altogether thus, this Puritan theory runs directly towards infidelity. It puts together terms which are in their own nature incompatible; and in asking us to believe them, necessarily remands our faith into the world of mere abstractions and notions. On this account it is, that we have denounced it as secretly the foe of Protestantism. We say most deliberately, that a christianity which is not historical, not the continuation organically of the proper life of the church as it has existed from the beginning—but which abjures all connection with this life as something false, and sets itself in contradiction to it as a totally new and different existence—can have no right whatever to challenge our faith, as being the same supernatural fact that is set before us by the article of the church in the ancient creed. It seeks to turn that fact into a wholesale lie, by making such supposition the only alternative to its own truth. No defence of Protestantism in this form can stand. To make the Reformation a mere rebellion, a radical revolution, a violent breaking away from the whole authority of the past, is to give it a purely human or rather an actually diabolical character. It comes then just to this, that either the rebellion was diabolical or else the ancient church back to the second century was the work of the Devil and not Christ's work. We are shut up to the necessity of rejecting one, in order that we may choose the other; for they are opposite interests, and the case will not allow us to acknowledge both at once. But who that has any faith in the supernatural mystery of the church, as it came from Christ in the beginning, can submit to the claims of Protestantism put into any such shape as this? Who of any sound christian feeling will bear to give up all antiquity in such radical style, for the sake of a wholly new system starting only in the sixteenth century? This is Puritanism; but we are not willing to allow that it is Protestantism, that it expresses the meaning of the Reformation in its true original sense. Puritanism is absolutely unhistorical by principle and profession; but Protestantism, if it have any right to exist at all, is the true historical continuation of the ancient church. To force the other character upon it, is to kill it root and branch.

We are sorry to find that Mr. Isaac Taylor, with all his learning and good sense, is not able to clear himself of this false and untenable ground, in his controversy with the Oxford theology. He sets out indeed with what might seem to a very strong acknowledgment, of the dependence of the modern church upon that of antiquity. The following passages are of great point

and force certainly, against the whole spirit of our reigning sect system at the present time, (wiser in its own conceit than seven men that can render a reason,) which only laughs at every sort of authority in such form, and counts *itself* to be nothing less than the direct embodiment of the bible over against all that the church has ever been before.

“ Looking at the Christian world at large, it is my full conviction, that there is just now a far more urgent need of persuasives to the study of Christian history and literature, than of cautions against the abuse of such studies. Too many feel and speak as if they thought there were no continuity in their religion; or as if there were no universal church; or as if the individual Christian, with his pocket bible in his hand, need fix his eyes upon nothing but the little eddy of his personal emotions; or as if Christianity were not what it is its glory and its characteristic to be—*a religion of history*.

“ Christianity, the pledge to man of eternity, is the occupant of all time; and not merely was it, itself, the ripening of the dispensations that had gone before it, but it was to be the home companion of the successive generations of man, until the consummation of all things. Not to know Christianity as the religion of all ages—as that which grasps and interprets the cycles of time, is to be in a condition like that of the man whose gloomy chamber admits only a single pencil of the universal radiance of noon.”—*Vol. I. p. 21, 22.*

“ If it be true that the general complexion of church history, through the course of long centuries, is such as to offend our preconceived notions, and to shock our spiritual tastes, and if, while we bend over the records of those dim eras, the promise of the Lord to be with his servants, still rings in our ears, as a doleful knell of hopes broken; if it be so, or as far as such may be the fact, the motive becomes more impressive and serious which impels us to acquire an authentic knowledge of this course of events, in all its details,—and if there are any who must acknowledge that they feel a peculiar repugnance in regard to church history, they are the very persons, more than any other, whom it behooves to school themselves in this kind of learning; for it seems more than barely probable, that this distaste springs from some ill affection of their own minds, demanding to be exposed and remedied. Such persons may well admit the supposition that they have hastily assumed certain notions of their Lord's principles of government, which are in fact unlike what, at length, they will find themselves to be subject to; and if so, the sooner they dispel any such false impressions, the better. On the face of the instance supposed, one should say, that any perplexities we may feel in regard to that course of events which constitutes the history of Christianity, proba-

bly spring from some deep-seated error of feeling, or of opinion, which, for our own sakes, we should carefully analyze."—*P.* 25.

"These indispensable studies, have, in fact, been revived of late, to a great extent. in our own, as well as other countries; while the use and necessity of them are forced anew upon the minds of all by the rapid and unexpected advances of Romanism, whose ministers are taking advantage of that ignorance of antiquity which has too long been the reproach of Protestantism."—*P.* 28.

"These 'fathers,' thus grouped as a little band, by the objectors, were some of them men of as brilliant genius as any age has produced: some, commanding a flowing and vigorous eloquence, some, an extensive erudition, some, conversant with the great world, some, whose meditations had been ripened by years of seclusion, some of them the only historians of the times in which they lived, some, the chiefs of the philosophy of their age; and, if we are to speak of the whole, as a series or body of writers, they are the men who, during a long era of deepening barbarism, still held the lamp of knowledge and learning, and, in fact, afford us almost all that we can now know, intimately, of the condition of the nations surrounding the Mediterranean, from the extinction of the classic fire, to the time of its rekindling in the fourteenth century. The church was the ark of all things that had life, during a deluge of a thousand years."—*P.* 34, 35.

"Nearly of the same quality, and usually advanced by the same parties, is the portentous insinuation, or the bold and appalling averment, that there was little or no genuine Christianity in the world from the times of Justin Martyr to those of Wicliffe, or of Luther! and the inference from this assumption is, that we are far more likely to be led astray than edified by looking into the literature of this vast territory of religious darkness.

"I must leave it to those who entertain any such sombre belief as this, to repel, in the best manner they are able, those fiery darts of infidelity which will not fail to be hurled at Christianity itself, as often as the opinion is professed. Such persons, too, must expound as they can, our Lord's parting promise to his servants."—*P.* 35.

"Christianity is absolute truth, bearing with various effect, from age to age, upon our distorted and discoloured human nature, but never so powerfully pervading the foreign substance it enters as to undergo no deflections itself, or to take no stains; and as its influence varies, from age to age, in intensity, as well as in the particular direction it may take, so does it exhibit, from age to age, great variations of form and hue. But the men of any one age indulge too much the overweening temper that attaches always to human nature, when they say to themselves—*our* Christianity is absolute Christianity; but that of such or such an age, was a mere shadow of it."—*P.* 36.

"The modern spirit of self-sufficiency seems to reach its climax in the contempt thrown by some upon those who, endowed with as much learning and acumen as ourselves, read the scriptures while the ink of the apostolic autographs had hardly faded."—P. 40.

"It is in fact a circumstance worthy to be noticed, that even the most ultra-protestant of ultra-protestants, if it happens to him to meet with a real or apparent confirmation of his peculiar views, within the circle of ecclesiastical antiquity, shows no reluctance whatever in snatching at it, and in turning it to the best account he can, piously quoting Irenæus, or Tertullian, or Ignatius, like any good Romanist! It is—'the bible, and the bible alone,' just when the evidence afforded, on some disputed point, by the writings of Ignatius, or Irenæus, or Tertullian, happens to tell in the wrong direction; otherwise, these 'papistical authorities' are good enough.—P. 52.

"It has been nothing so much as this inconsiderate 'bible alone' outcry, that has given modern Popery so long a reprieve in the heart of Protestant countries; and it is now the very same zeal, without discretion, that opens a fair field for the spread of the doctrines of the Oxford Tracts."—P. 54.

These, we say, are sound and true sentiments. But they are not well sustained by Mr. Taylor's own work. The only use he sees proper to make of ecclesiastical history after all, is such as is made of the testimony of a common witness in a court of law. The voice of the church is to him only as the voice of the profane world, the authority of the fathers of one and the same order with the authority of Tacitus or Pliny. Antiquity may help us to the knowledge of some facts, but nothing more; to sit in judgment on the facts, to make out their true value, to accept them as grains of gold or reject them as heaps of trash, is the high prerogative of modern reason, acting in its triple office of lawyer, jurymen, and judge. The rule or standard of judgment is indeed professedly the bible, God's infallible word; but the *tribunal* for interpreting and applying it, the highest and last resort therefore in all cases of controversy and appeal, is always the mind of the present age as distinguished from every age that has gone before. Mr. Taylor's standpoint is completely subjective. It is not the right position, for doing justice to any history; but least of all, for doing justice to the history of God's church. For if the church be what it professed to be at the start, and what it is acknowledged by the whole christian world to be in the creed, it is a supernatural constitution, and in such view must have a supernatural history. A divine church with a purely human history, is for faith a contradiction in terms. In

any such view however, it is something fairly monstrous to think of turning the whole process into the play of simply human factors, and then requiring it to bend everywhere to the measure of our modern judgment. But this precisely is what Mr. Isaac Taylor allows himself to do. With the bible in hand, he finds it a most easy and reasonable thing to rule out of court the universal voice of the church, from the second century if need be to the sixteenth, wherever it refuses to chime in with his own mind. In this way he falls in fact into the theory and method of Puritanism, under the most perfectly arbitrary form. Protestantism in his hands ceases to be historical altogether, and stands forward in direct antagonism to the life of the early church. The relation between the two systems is made to be one of violent contradiction and opposition. It admits of no organic reconciliation. To make good the modern cause, antiquity is presented to us under attributes that destroy its whole title to our confidence and respect. It becomes indeed an unintelligible riddle. It is the church of Christ in the habiliments of hell; or shall we call it rather a hideous vision of Satan himself, transformed for the time into an angel of light?

"Our brethren of the early church," Mr. Taylor himself tells us (*Vol. I. p. 37*), "challenge our respect, as well as affection; for theirs was the fervour of a steady faith in things unseen and eternal; theirs often a meek patience and humility, under the most grievous wrongs; theirs the courage to maintain a good profession before the frowning face of philosophy, of secular tyranny, and of splendid superstition; theirs was abstractedness from the world, and a painful self-denial; theirs the most arduous and costly labours of love; theirs a munificence in charity, altogether without example; theirs was a reverent and scrupulous care of the sacred writings, and this merit, if they had had no other, is of a superlative degree, and should entitle them to the veneration and grateful regards of the modern church. How little do many readers of the Bible, now-a-days, think of what it cost the Christians of the second and third centuries, merely to rescue and hide the sacred treasure from the rage of the heathen!"

This is a beautiful and bright picture. But, alas, the historical analysis that follows turns it all into shame. Nothing can well be more gloomy and oppressive to a truly christian mind, than the light in which the fathers of these first centuries, together with the theology and piety of the ancient church generally, are made to show themselves beneath the pencil of this brilliant and fluent writer. False principles came in from the start, not

affecting simply the surface of the new religion, but carrying the poison of death into its very heart. Gnosticism, though resisted and conquered on the outside of the church, had a full triumph within. Out of it grew the ascetic system, false views of marriage, the glorification of virginity, monasticism, and all kindred views. The celibate corrupted the whole scheme of theology. Christianity itself is opposed to the Oriental theosophy, proceeding throughout on a different view of the world; and it vanquished this enemy in fact. But only, we are told, to take it again into its own bosom. "The catholic church opposed its substantial truths to these baseless and malignant speculations; and triumphed: but alas, it fell in triumphing." Gnosticism thus infused its own antichristian soul into the entire body of the Nicene theology.¹ Parallel with this doctrinal corruption, ran a corresponding corruption of the whole life of religion practically considered. The true scheme of salvation was to a great extent lost. Repentance and justification by faith sunk out of sight, overwhelmed completely by a factitious religion of outward forms and rites. The sacraments were exaggerated into saving mysteries. Polytheism, expelled and subdued under its heathen character, rose into power again as Christian demonolatry, the worship of saints, relics and images; all in pure contradiction to the original genius of the gospel. Along with this system went the universal noise of prodigies and miracles. These were "lying wonders," piously contrived to keep up the credit of the reigning superstitions. They are not insulated instances merely of alleged supernatural agency, but form a *miraculous dispensation*, running on from year to year, and carrying along with it the ostensible faith and homage of the whole church. At the same time it is plain enough to modern common sense, that the dispensation was throughout an enormous cheat, kept up by the priesthood for their own ends. Even the best men of the church, such as the Nicene fathers generally, must have been more or less privy to these awfully wicked frauds.² St. Ambrose, for instance, must have first buried the

¹ "The massive walls of the church, like a hastily constructed coffer-dam, had repelled, from age to age, the angry billows of the Gnostic heresy, which could never open a free passage for themselves within the sacred enclosure. Nevertheless these waters, bitter and turbid, no sooner rose high around the shattered structure, than, through a thousand fissures, they penetrated, and in fact stood at one and the same mean level, within, where they were silently stagnant, as without, where they were in angry commotion."—*Vol. I. p. 175.*

² "It will be my painful task, to lay open the shameless frauds and im-

skeletons, during the night, which he pretended to discover the next day, by divine revelation, as the remains of the martyrs Gervasius and Protasius; must have hired men to act the part of demoniacs, who should bear testimony to the truth of the discovery, drilling them well into their diabolical parts; must have engaged Severus, the butcher, to feign himself restored to sight by touching the covering of the relics, as they were borne in solemn procession to their new resting place beneath the altar of the Ambrosian church. And yet Ambrose was one of the best and greatest men, belonging to the history of the ancient church.

With such a view of the theology and life of the fourth century, Mr. Taylor finds it natural and easy to charge the system directly with the universal decay of morals, that marked the last stage of the old Roman civilization. All came, by necessary derivation, from the "church principles" of the third and fourth centuries. The cause which Christ had founded for the salvation of the world, proved in the end like the breath of the Sirocco, sweeping it with an unmeasurable curse.¹

This may suffice for our present purpose; which is not to discuss directly the merit of our author's positions; but simply to set them in contrast with the other side of his own picture of this same ancient Christianity, in argument and proof of the perfectly unhistorical character of his general scheme. A man may talk as he pleases about the glories of the early church, Christ's presence in it, and its victories over error and sin; if he couple with it the idea of such wholesale falsehood and corruption as is here laid to its charge, all this praise is made absolutely void.²

pious miracle-mongering, by means of which the trade of the priests at these magnificent shrines was kept agoing; frauds incomparably more discreditable than were any that had been practised in the heathen oracular temples. This is indeed a heavy theme; and how sorrowful—how sickening, when a man like Chrysostom is found acting as the Hierophant of these mysteries of iniquity!"—*Vol. II. p. 207.*

¹ "Christianity, as restored by the Reformers, has gradually regenerated the countries which have freely entertained it; while, on the contrary, Christianity, as debased by the Nicene divines, after quickly spending its healthful forces, only served to hurry the nations downward into—to use Salvian's language—'a sink of debauchery.'"—*Vol. II. p. 37.*

² "The ancient church having compromised the greatest truths, and thereby forfeited the guidance of the Spirit of Truth, rushed forward, without a check, on every path of artificial excitement; and being at the same time urged by the circumstances of its precarious conflict with the expiring paganism, as well as with innumerable new-born heresies, to strengthen itself by the nefarious arts of popular influence—by factitious terrors, hopes, wonders, it regarded no scruples of honor, and threw the reins on the neck of fanatical extravagance."—*Vol. II. 157.* If this be true, what nonsense to speak of *such* a heaven-forsaken church, as being in any sense the ark of religion or the pillar and ground of the truth!

The two thoughts refuse to stand together. One necessarily excludes the other. Common history will not endure any such gross contradiction. But still less can it be reconciled with any faith in the history of the church, as a supernatural order. If Ambrose could so lend himself to the Devil, he was no saint. If the church generally was so terribly corrupt both in doctrine and practice, embodying in itself the worst principles of heathenism, God surely was not in the midst of it as a Saviour and King. It was, clear back to the third and even to the second century, the synagogue in truth of Satan, the unclean temple and home of Antichrist.

For the errors and corruptions here set to its account, are not represented as partial only or relative, the exaggerations or distortions merely of acknowledged truth and sound christian feeling. In that view, they might still be reconciled with the idea of a truly historical church, bearing in its bosom the supernatural presence of its glorified Head. Faith in the continuity of the church as a divine fact, (the proper mystery of the creed,) by no means requires us to overlook or deny the frailties and follies that necessarily belong to the human side of its history. But in the case before us, the human, which left to itself is always the diabolical also, is made absolutely to overwhelm the divine. All resolves itself pragmatically into the play of worldly factors, often of the most ignoble kind, in no real union whatever with heavenly factors in any way answerable to the promise, "Lo, I am with you always to the end of the world." At best the heavenly is sublimated into the notion only of God's providence, as it floats over *all* human history—a Gnostic conception, that falls immeasurably short of the mystery set before us in the creed. The errors and corruptions charged upon the church here, are such as strike at the very root of its inmost sanctuary, we may say, of its universal constitution and life. They are false, not by excess or distortion merely, but by principle; being nothing less, in truth, than the introduction of another gospel altogether, whose swift triumphs soon supplanted the original and proper sense of Christianity, from one end of its broad domain to the other.

If Protestantism then is to be defended successfully it can be neither on the ground that it is a repristination simply of early post-apostolical christianity, nor on the ground that it is an absolute nullification of this ancient faith, leaping over it with a single bound to the age of the Apostles.

We are shut up thus to the idea of *historical development*, as the only possible way of escape from the difficulty with which

we are met in bringing the present here into comparison with the past. If the modern church must be the same in substance with the ancient church, a true continuation of its life as this has been in the world by divine promise from the beginning, while it is perfectly plain at the same time that a wide difference holds between the two systems as to form, the relation binding them together can only be one of living progress or growth. No other will satisfy these opposite conditions. Growth implies unity in the midst of change. That precisely is what we are to understand by historical development. We do not say now, that it is actually the true key to the problem of Protestantism. We say merely, that if this interest be at all capable of rational apology, in the face of its notorious disagreement with ancient christianity, it can be in this way only and in no other. If we are not at liberty to apply the law of organic progress to the case, there is no help for the cause of the Reformation, the facts being what we find them to be in actual history. Let those look to it, who pretend to be the most staunch friends of Protestantism by scouting the entire idea of any such law; who will have it either that their own small version of Christianity in this form, as given in some one of our sects, is a true picture of what the church was in the beginning of the second century, or that it is against this altogether, and above it, as being the re-assertion at last of the original and proper sense of the New Testament, from which the whole course of history immediately afterwards fell away. Neither of these alternatives can stand. The present here is plainly not one with the past; but just as little may it pretend to be the nullification of the past, or its plump contradiction.

Some pretend to identify this doctrine of development with the system of Romanism itself; as though the only occasion for it were found in the variations through which it is supposed to have passed in reaching its present form. Nor have Romanists themselves been unwilling always, to allow it a certain amount of truth. It is not easy to deny certainly, that very considerable changes had place in the history of Christianity before the time of the Reformation; and this might seem to be a natural and ready view, for surmounting the objection drawn from them against the stability and unity of the Catholic church. Mr. Newman, it is well known, has tried to turn the idea to account in this way, in his memorable Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine. Few theological tracts, in the English language are more worthy of being read, or more likely to reward a diligent perusal with lasting benefit and fruit. The author

holds christianity to be an objective fact in the world, that must be throughout identical with itself.¹ Still that it has undergone serious modifications in its outward form and aspect, he considers to be no less certain and clear. To reconcile this semblance of discrepancy then, he has recourse to what he calls the *theory of developments*. It is of the nature of a living idea to expand itself, to take new form, as it comes by the course of history into new relations requiring its application in new ways. At the same time however it carries in itself, from the start, the type and norm of all that it is subsequently to become. We must distinguish accordingly between a true development in such view and a corruption which transforms the very substance of the idea itself into something else. Mr. Newman lays down no less than seven tests, by which we may be guided and assisted in making this important distinction; and then goes on to apply the subject, by illustrations drawn with great force and effect from the actual history of the church in past ages. The whole theory, however, has been condemned by other Romanists, as being at war with the true genius of the Catholic religion. Mr. Brownson of our own country in particular, it will be remembered, set himself in vigorous opposition to it from the start. Catholicism, as he will have it, has known no change. It is only Protestantism that has moved away from what the church was in the begin-

¹ "Christianity is no dream of the study or the cloister. It has long since passed beyond the letter of documents and the reasonings of individual minds, and has become public property.—It has from the first had an objective existence.—Its home is in the world.—The hypothesis, indeed, has met with wide reception in these latter ages. that Christianity does not fall within the province of history, that it is to each man what each man thinks it to be, and nothing else.—Or again, it has been maintained, or implied, that all existing denominations of christianity are wrong, none representing it as taught by Christ and his Apostles; that it died out of the world at its birth, and was forthwith succeeded by a counterfeit or counterfeits which assumed its name, though they inherited but a portion of its teaching; that it has existed indeed among men ever since, and exists at this day, but as a secret and hidden doctrine, which does but revive here and there under a supernatural influence in the hearts of individuals, and is manifested to the world only by glimpses or in gleams, according to the number or the station of the illuminated, and their connexion with the history of their times." All this however, the writer tells us truly, is at best in itself a *hypothesis* only. The only natural assumption is the contrary, namely, "to take it for granted that the christianity of the second, fourth, seventh, twelfth, sixteenth, and intermediate centuries, is in its *substance* the very religion which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first, whatever may be the modifications for good or for evil, which lapse of years, or the vicissitudes of human affairs have impressed upon it.—The *onus probandi* is with those who assert what it is unnatural to expect; to be just able to doubt is no warrant for disbelieving."—*Introduction*.

ning, and that is still always in motion and never at rest. It is only Protestantism, that needs any such law of development to account for its changes; and to Protestantism alone, accordingly, the whole theory legitimately and of right belongs.*

Be this as it may, Protestantism at all events is still less able to get along without the help of some such theory than Romanism. In no other way possibly, can it make good its claim to be the historical continuance at all of the supernatural fact which the church is allowed to have been in the beginning.^a This is now felt by all, who deserve to be considered of any authority in the sphere of church history. The whole progress of this science at the present time, under the new impulse which has been given to it by Neander and others, is making it more and more ridiculous to think of upholding the cause of the Reformation under any other view. It *must* be one with the ancient church, to have any valid claim to its prerogatives and powers; but this it *can* be only in the way of historical growth. Give that up, and all is gone. Without the idea of development, the whole fact of Protestantism resolves itself into a fearful lie.

Those who wish to see this subject ably and happily handled, are referred to Professor Schaff's *Principle of Protestantism*, the special object of which is to exhibit and defend the idea of

* Mr. Brownson's judgment in this case is not to be taken, of course, as at once final and conclusive for the Catholic church. Mr. Newman's book was written before he became a Romanist in form; but it has been defended by some in that communion; and we do not find, that Mr. Newman himself, since his conversion, has renounced the general doctrine of it as wrong. On the contrary, if we understand him rightly, it is distinctly affirmed still in some of his recent lectures. Mühler has the same thought.

^a Mr. Newman will tell us, that even in *this* way it is perfectly indefensible, as being not a true development at all of what Christianity was in the beginning, but its radical corruption. "Whatever be historical Christianity, it is not Protestantism; if ever there were a safe truth it is this.—Protestants can as little bear its Ante-nicene as its Post-tridentine period.—So much must the Protestant grant, that if such a system of doctrine as he would now introduce ever existed in early times, it has been clean swept away as if by a deluge, suddenly, silently, and without memorial; by a deluge coming in a night, and utterly soaking, rotting, heaving up, and hurrying off every vestige of what it found in the church, before cock-crowing; so that 'when they rose in the morning,' her true seed 'were all dead corpses'—nay dead and buried—and without a grave-stone." This we may consider to be exaggeration and mistake; since it amounts to a full condemnation of Protestantism in every view, as being without all real root in the past life of the church. But it only shows the more strongly, what necessity there is of making out the line of a true historical succession in its favor, by a deeper and better apprehension if possible of this idea of development.

historical development in its application to the Protestant movement. This work we have noticed at some length on a former occasion. It was decried, on its first appearance, by a certain class of Protestants, as being inimical to the very cause it professed to defend. But it was only because the author had a far deeper insight into the necessities of his subject, than those who thus judged him were able to understand. They belonged to the unchurchly, unhistorical school, for which Christianity is a mere matter of opinion or notion, and which has no difficulty accordingly in setting all the laws of real history, as well as all the conditions of a truly supernatural church, at the most perfect defiance, in order to carry out its own dogmatical abstractions. Dr. Schaff had entered too far into the modern sense of history and the proper idea of the church, to be satisfied with any such poor and superficial habit of thought. He saw the absolute necessity of showing Protestantism to be historical, in the full modern force of this most significant term, for the purpose of vindicating its right to exist; and his work accordingly is a most honest and vigorous attempt to defend it on this ground. We have said before, what we now deliberately repeat, that it is the best apology for the cause of the Reformation which has yet appeared in this country. If this cause is to be successfully upheld at all, it can only be, we believe, on the general ground taken in this book. However it may be as regards details, the argument in its main course and scheme may be considered identical now with the very life of Protestantism. It is approved and endorsed in such view, we may say, by the whole weight of German theological science, as it appears in its best representatives at the present time. The Reformation, according to this scheme, was not a revolution, radically upsetting the church as it stood before. In that view it must have been a new religion, and would have needed miracles to support its claims. It was merely a disengagement of the old life of the church from the abuses, with which it became burdened in the course of time, and its advancement to a form more congenial, than that which it carried before, with the wants of the modern world. It was no nullification thus of previous history, no return simply to what christianity was supposed to have been in the beginning; its connection with that was still through the intervening history of the old Catholic church; and from the bosom of this church it sprang by true living derivation and birth. Protestantism is no repudiation then of ancient christianity, nor of the proper religious life of the middle ages. It owes its being to this old life, which was engaged for centuries before with its painful parturition. Here is

the idea of historical development. But the theory goes farther still. Protestantism, the favorite child of Catholicism, is not itself a full realization of the true idea of Christianity. It has terrible defects upon it, malignant diseases, belonging as would seem to its very blood, which are growing always worse and worse, and threaten to bring upon it in the end full dissolution. It will not do then to rest in it as the absolute consummation of the church. To take it for that, is again to turn it palpably into a lie. As it was not the first form of Christianity, so neither may it be considered the last. It is itself a process of transition only towards a higher and better state of the church, which is still future though probably now near at hand, and the coming in of which may be expected to form an epoch in history quite as great at least as that of the Reformation itself. The result of this new development will be the recovery of Protestantism itself from the evils under which it now suffers, and in this way its full and final vindication by the judgment of history. It will be however, at the same time, a vindication of Catholicism also, as having been of true historical necessity in its day for the full working out of the problem which shall thus be conducted at last to its glorious solution. Such, we say, is the theory of *historical development*, as we have it applied in this interesting and able tract to the great question here brought into view; the question, namely, how Protestantism is to be set in harmony with the past history of the church, and with its true ideal as the kingdom of God, a supernatural polity of truth and righteousness among men.

This German idea of development, as we may call it, is not the same with that presented to us by Dr. Newman. The last is a continuous expansion and enlargement under the same form and in the same general direction; the process involves no disorder or contradiction in its own movement; it is the full sense always, as far as it goes, of what the church was in fact and intention from the beginning; it is the simple coming out of this sense, in a view answerable to the new relations of its history from age to age; each stage of development is by itself normal and full, and so of force for all time; all moves thus in the line of Catholicism only, without the possibility of growing into anything like Protestantism; on which account, accordingly, this must be regarded as a corruption of the original idea of Christianity, by which it is changed into another type and fashion altogether. It is not easy in truth to conceive of the old Catholic system blossoming into Protestantism, in the way of any such regular and direct growth; and there seems to be no room there-

fore, for the supposition, that Dr. Newman's conception of development goes against the pretensions of the Roman church.* The German theory however does do so, in the most emphatic manner. Its idea of growth is that of a process carried forward, by the action of different forces, working separately to some extent, and so it may be even onesidedly and contradictorily for a time, towards a concrete result representing in full unity at last the true meaning and power of the whole. Each part of the process then is regarded as necessary and right in its own order and time; but still only as *relatively* right, and as having need thus to complete itself, by passing ultimately into a higher form. Catholicism in this view is justified as a true and legitimate movement of the church; but it is taken to have been the explication of one side of Christianity mainly, rather than a full and proper representation of the fact as a whole; a process thus that naturally became excessive, and so wrong, in its own direction, preparing the way for a powerful reaction finally in the opposite direction. This reaction we have in Protestantism; which in such view springs from the old church, not just by uniform progress, but with a certain measure of violence, while yet it is found to be the product really and truly of its deeper life. Here again however, as before, the first result is only relatively good. The new tendency has become itself onesided, exorbitant, and full of wrong. Hence the need of still another crisis, (the signs of whose advent many seem already to see,)

* We meet with the same thought in Tertullian. "There is nothing," he tells us, "which does not advance by age. All things wait upon time; as the preacher saith, there is a time for every thing. Look at the natural world, and see the plant gradually ripening to its fruit, first a mere grain; from the grain arises the green stalk, and from the stalk shoots up the shrub; then the boughs and branches get strength, and the tree is complete; thence the swelling bud, and from the bud the blossom, and from the flower the fruit; which at the first crude and shapeless, by little and little proceeds, and attains its ripe softness and flavor. And so in religion, for it is the same God of nature and of religion; at first in its rudiments only, nature surmising something concerning God; then by the law and the prophets advanced to its infant state; then by the Gospel it reached the heats of youth; and now by the Comforter is moulded to its maturity." Tertullian speaks here as a Montanist, but the thought itself may be applied to the gradual expansion of the Catholic system. Isaac Taylor sets it down, in this view, as the foundation principle of Romanism (Vol. I. p. 93-96). He wrongs the church however, by charging it with the introduction of new revelations. The supposed innovations of the system came in always as the growth merely of what was at hand before. The expansion thus claimed to be organic, the actualization simply of the previously potential. It was a development in every case, professedly, and not a proper apocalypse.

which may arrest and correct this abuse, and open the way for a higher and better state of the church, in which both these great tendencies shall be brought at length happily to unite, revealing to the world the full sense of Christianity in a form now absolute and complete.

For a truly learned representation of this whole view, in its relations to other older schemes of ecclesiastical history, (for there has been a remarkable exemplification of the law of development in the progress of this science itself,) we beg leave to refer our readers to Professor Schaff's tract entitled, *What is Church History?* They will find it well worthy of their most careful and diligent perusal.

We have spoken before of Thiersch's "Lectures on Catholicism and Protestantism." They abound in original and fresh thought, pervaded throughout with a tone of the most earnest piety, though not altogether free at times from the excesses of an erratic fancy. The history of the church is with him also a grand and complicated process, exposed to powerful corruptions, and yet moving onward always towards the full consummation of its own original idea; which is not to be reached however without the intervention of a new supernatural apostolate, in all respects parallel with that which was employed for the first establishment of Christianity in the beginning. The church, he thinks, has passed through four great metamorphoses already, in coming to its present condition. First we have it under its *Old Catholic* form, as it existed between the age of the Apostles and the time of Constantine. Then it appears as the *Imperial* (*Græco-Roman*) church, in close connection with the state, and undergoing many corruptions and changes. Next it becomes the *Roman Catholic* church of the middle ages. Last of all it stands before us as the *Protestant* church. This was called forth, with a sort of inward necessity, by the corruptions and abuses of the Roman system; and it has its full historical justification, in the actual religious benefits it has conferred upon the world; benefits that may be said to show themselves even in the improved character of Romanism itself. Still it is but too plain, that Protestantism is not the full-successful solution of the problem of Christianity. It has not fulfilled the promise of its own beginning; and it carries in it no pledge now of any true religious millenium in time to come. Evils of tremendous character are lodged within its bosom. A reign of rationalism and unbelief has sprung out of it, for which the present course of things, in the view of Thiersch, offers no prospect of recovery or help. It is no relief, in such case, to know

that the Catholic church, in countries where it has no Protestantism as a rival at its side, such for instance as South America or Spain, is in a moral condition equally if not still more deplorable. It is only the more sad, that neither *here* nor *there* the proper face of the true church is to be discerned. "Whether the Reformers, could they have seen the present posture of the church that goes by their name, would have regretted and cursed their own work, as has been often said, we know not; but it is certain that a keen eye and a strong faith are needed, in view of the general declension that prevails, not to overlook the good which is still left, and to see in it the germ of a better future. Of such future however one of the most necessary conditions is just this, that we should learn to maintain a proper bearing towards the Catholic church and its peculiarities." The self-sufficiency of both systems must come to an end, before room can be made for that higher state of the church, which God may be expected then to bring in by miraculous dispensation, restoring all things to their proper form.

Professor Rothe takes a different view, conditioned by his speculative construction of Christianity in its relations to Nature and Humanity, as we have this fully brought out, with unparalleled architectonic power, in his *Theological Ethics*. The idea of the church he takes to be accidental, rather than essential, to the religious life of the world. The ultimate and only fully normal order of man's existence is the state, the organism of his moral relations, which can never be complete save as they are brought in the end to embrace all that is included also in the sense of religion. Such will be at last the actual consummation of the process, by which our world is now fulfilling its original destiny and design. The process itself however is conditioned now by the fact of redemption, made necessary through sin. This implies a new power brought into the world for its sanctification; a power in such view different from the natural life of the world, but fitted at the same time to take possession of this life always more and more, and finally to transform it fully into its own image. So far as Christianity continues in such distinction from the world naturally considered, it must have its own organization as something distinct from the state, and as something necessarily also in conflict to a certain extent with its very conception. This organization gives us the proper fact of the church. Its relation to the state is at first one of broad opposition; but in the nature of the case it is in this respect a changing and flowing relation; for as the state receives into it more and more the power of the christian life, through the agency of

the church, the mission and work of this last over against it shrink always into narrower bounds, so that the assertion of its authority becomes at last a source of oppression and restraint. In the end thus it comes naturally to a rebellion against the idea of the church, as an exclusive institute for the purposes of religion. This was the true sense of the Reformation. It involved the breaking up of the old Catholic doctrine of the church, as something good in its time but no longer answerable to the advanced age of the world, for the necessary purpose of securing free room and scope for the forces of religion under a different form, that namely which is presented to us in the constitution of the state. There is still indeed a demand for the action of the church, and but little prospect as yet that this demand will soon come to an end; but the first step has been taken towards what is to be at last the true order of religion; the vanishing nature of the church has begun to be apparent; its former attributes are passing away; we find it in a chaos of dissolution, the result of which will be in due time its universal absorption into the political organism which has been its rival from the beginning.¹

This is truly a startling way of bringing the problem of Protestantism to a solution; and it is no wonder perhaps that the religious world, even in Germany itself, where the church might seem indeed to be fast tumbling into ruins, has not been able yet to look upon the view with much favor. Still it is the view of a most earnestly religious man, who is at the same time one

¹ "There is bitter complaint made in our day, especially in Evangelical Christendom, of the decline of the church. With right and without right, as we choose to take it. With right; for the church, *as a church*, is in reality falling always more and more into ruins, and how it may or can be helped up again, even with the best will on the side of government, is in no wise to be seen. Without right; for this collapse of the church is just the consequence of the maturity and independence of the christian life, which thus breaks the old form that has become too strait for it, and escaping from its restraints runs joyfully towards its true element, the state. We will acknowledge unreservedly the decline of the church, but in the complaint which is made on this account we will take no part. As it seems to us, the general position in which we have tried to set the reader is the only one, from which one can survey the whole course of church history, without danger of falling out with its movement.—From this standpoint alone also, do we first reach a real justification of the Reformation against Catholicism. So long as the *church* is considered to be the highest and only proper realization of the christian life, the act must in truth be set down for a crime, by which the unity of the church, and so the church itself, has been and only could be dashed to pieces."—*Die Anfänge d. chr. Kirche*, p. 88.

of the profoundest thinkers and most learned scholars of the age, grappling here in all his strength with what he feels to be the very life question of Protestantism itself; and it well deserves attention in such light, if for no other reason yet at least for this, that it goes to show how real and serious the general problem is, which is here offered for our consideration. Puritanism, with its ordinary want of historical sensibility and its most superficial conception of the mystery of the church, may affect to find no difficulty in the whole subject, and can easily afford to dismiss every theory of this sort as a vain and superfluous speculation. It needs no solution for a knot, which it has no power to see. But for all this, the knot itself is there, and it is one of no common intricacy and force. Puritanism is ready at once to reject Rothe's resolution of the church into the state; but only because it does not admit at all the idea of the church in his sense, and in the old christian sense, as distinguished from the idea of the state. That whole idea is for it from the start a falsehood, the very *proton-pseudos* we may say of Romanism. Its highest order is only the state throughout, or man in the form of natural political society. The church has no absolute necessity; it is not of the essence of religion in any way; this holds in humanity as such under the political order; and it is the glory of Protestantism, as well as its only true sense, to assert such independence to the fullest extent. Hence many churches instead of one; any number of them indeed, to suit the world's taste; till the whole conception runs out finally into the open sea of no church whatever. And what less is this, we ask, than Rothe's version of the Reformation—the breaking up, namely, of the old doctrine of the holy catholic church, as we find it in the creed, and the first grand step towards its full formal dissolution at last in the all devouring idea of the state?

The whole theory, with all our respect for Rothe, we of course at once repudiate as unsound and false. How could the idea of the church be an object of faith, that is a supernatural mystery of like order with the other articles of the creed, if it were after all any such merely provisional and transient fact, (a downright "*figment*" the Puritan Recorder would say rather,) designed to pass away finally in another conception altogether? We might just as well resolve the resurrection of the body, with Hymeneus and Philetus, into the idea of a new moral life begun in the present world. It will not do to defend Protestantism, by surrendering Christianity. We are not willing to give up for it either history or the creed.

Rothe's error, we think, lies in the assumption, that the econo-

my of the world naturally considered must be regarded as carrying in itself, from the beginning, all the necessary elements and conditions of a perfect humanity; in which view a real redemption must complete its work under the form of our present telluric life, (though not of course without the resurrection,) keeping itself to the organism of earth where the law of sin and death now reigns, and achieving a true and proper victory here on the theatre of the actual curse, instead of translating its subjects for this purpose, in a violent way, over into some altogether new and different order of being. A scientific apprehension of what the world is as a historical process or *cosmos*, would seem indeed to require that it should not be defeated in its highest end, the glorification of humanity, by the disorder of sin—that with reference to this it should not turn out a hopeless failure, an irrecoverable wreck, from which man must be extricated by an act of sheer power for the accomplishment of his salvation somewhere else. But we have no right to assume in this way, that the proper sense of the world in its natural order lies wholly in itself as an independent and separate system. The overshadowing embrace of a higher economy—the absolutely supernatural—we must believe rather to have been needed from the first to complete its process in the life of man. In such view, redemption is more than the carrying out of the natural order of the world to any merely natural end; and the church, as the medium of its work, is more than a provisional institute simply for perfecting the scheme of the state, the highest form of man's life on the basis of nature as it now stands. The true destination of this lies beyond the present economy of nature in the sphere of the supernatural, in an order of things that fairly outleaps and transcends the whole system out of which grows now the constitution of political kingdoms and states. In the kingdom of heaven, the last and most perfect order of humanity, as "they neither marry nor are given in marriage," so also there will be neither Greek nor Jew, but the whole idea of nationality is to be taken up, as it would appear, into a far higher and wider conception, rooted not in nature but in grace. The church will not lose itself in the state; but it will be the state rather that shall be found then to have vanished away in the church.

We have then this result. Since Protestantism is not the same thing with primitive post-apostolical Christianity, but this last looks rather directly towards Romanism; and since, at the same time, Protestantism cannot be historically divorced from the first life of the church, and set in full rebellion against it, (if the church was originally what it claimed to be, a divine

supernatural fact and not a hellish imposture,) without forfeiting all title to our faith and trust; there is but one view only in which it is possible to uphold rationally the modern system, and that is the view of historical development; which however must be so taken, that it shall not on the one side remain hopelessly bound to the limits of the Roman system, as in the hands of Dr. Newman, nor yet on the other side run itself out into a fair dissolution of the very idea with which it started, whether this be by the Hegelian dialectics of a man like Baur or by such more respectable theories as we have from the hands of Rothe and Thiersch. A development into sheer vacuity, is only another word for annihilation. If *that* be the true sense of Protestantism as related to the old mystery of the church, all defence of it for faith is gone. It must be a real historical continuation of the church, in the verity of its old supernatural existence, carrying along with it a true participation in its prerogatives and powers, or it is nothing.

It is not necessary now that we should be prepared to determine positively the true construction and proper significance of Protestantism beyond the result now stated, in order to make this result itself of practical account. It is of high account at all events to see what are the necessary conditions of the question which is to be solved, what are the terms and limits within which the solution must move, whatever view we may choose to take of it afterwards as restrained to such bounds. It is much only to have it settled in our minds, that the defence of Protestantism, if it is to be made good at all, must be conducted in a certain general way, whether any particular plan of such defence may be counted satisfactory or not. We propose at present no positive doctrine on the subject one way or another. That has not been the object at all of these articles. We have wished merely to show that the nature of Christianity, and the facts of history, require the argument for Protestantism to run in a certain line, if it is to be of any force; and that no different form of apology, in which this general necessity is overlooked or trampled under foot, can deserve to be regarded with respect. No view of Protestantism can be either sound or safe, which by setting it in absolute universal opposition to Catholicism makes it to be unhistorical, and so cuts it off from all lot or part in the inheritance of the past life of the church.

Nothing more than the sense of this plain truth is needed, to expose the vanity of all that system of polemics against the church of Rome, which proceeds on the assumption that it is purely and entirely false and corrupt, and that it deserves no

hearing in truth, and much less anything like calm respect, whatever it may pretend to urge in its own defence.

We are all familiar with the anti-popery spirit under this radical and fanatical form. Our common religious press may be said to teem with it every week. It meets us on the street and in all public places. Our very piety is infected with it to a large extent, both in the sanctuary and in the domestic circle. The fountains of our charity are turned by it too often into wormwood and gall. Many appear to look upon it as one main part of their religion, a necessary evidence of their evangelical temper and habit, to hate and curse the Catholics. However it may be in any other direction, here at least they feel that they do well, as it would seem, to be angry, to show contempt, and to indulge misrepresentation and abuse, to their heart's full content. Nicknames are so pat to the tongue, that they flow from it like the poison of asps without effort or thought. All too in Christ's sweet and holy name. The most abominable charges and criminations are trumpeted without proof, as though the bold repetition of them simply were enough in the end to make them good. No pains are taken to understand any doctrine or practice of the church, in the light of its own historical or theological relations; it is counted quite sufficient to drag every article in the most rude and vulgar way before the tribunal of the world's common sense, (alas, how *common* in many cases,) and to take the measure of its merits accordingly; as though the deepest mysteries of religion might be settled by such superficial and profane judgment, as it were at a moment's glance. All runs out easily thus into the most wholesale censure and reproach. Romanism is found to be, from beginning to end, a tissue of impiety and folly, at war with the most sacred interests of humanity, and in full contradiction to the will of God. It is a diabolical conspiracy against truth and righteousness. There is no reason in any of its institutions; they are founded on falsehood throughout; they subvert the whole sense of the gospel, and in their source and operation are purely antichristian, of one order we may say with infidelity itself. Such in general is the tenor of this popular theory.

But no such style of thinking can be maintained, where anything like a sound historical feeling has been brought into exercise in regard to the church. Those who look at Romanism only in this rabid and fanatical way, show themselves by the very fact to have no sense of the divine organization of Christianity as a perpetual living constitution in the world, and no apprehension of the necessity there is that Protestantism should

be strictly and truly the product of this life, if it can have any right to exist at all. They make no account of history. Their view of Protestantism is such as cuts it off entirely from the concrete mystery of the church in past ages, and turns it thus into a mere abstraction. In this way it is essentially rationalistic and infidel; and it is ever ready accordingly to make common cause with open unbelief, in treating the whole real past of the church as a sort of universal cheat and lie. Faith in historical Christianity at once upsets every such habit of thought; and in doing so necessarily begets a more just and tolerant spirit towards the present Catholic church. It does so in a two-fold view, first as it regards the past, and secondly as it throws its eye forward into the future.

As regards the past, the faith now mentioned feels itself bound to derive the life of Protestantism, genealogically, from the historical church of previous ages; which at the same time is clearly seen to carry in it the leading features of Romanism away back to the Nicene age, and in element or germ at least beyond that also up to the very middle of the second century. Now it need not follow from this, that all such features are to be approved as right and good for all time; nor even that they were in all cases right and good at any time. The very idea of the Reformation implies the contrary; for the meaning of it is, that many things belonging to the old church were either abuses in their own nature, or had grown to be such by the progress of history, which it was necessary at last to thrust wholly out of the way. But no one who has any sense of the divine constitution of the church can bring himself to look upon its whole past order and spirit, for this reason, as false and wrong; nor can he think of denouncing even what he may not be able to approve, in any such style of vituperation as our modern anti-papery sees fit to indulge in towards what it calls the abominations of Romanism. Here then it becomes at once impossible for any person of this sort, to sympathize with the vulgar method of fighting the Roman Catholics which we have now under consideration. Take it, for instance, as it comes before us in "Kirwan," or in the pages of the "Protestant Quarterly Review." It not only fights Romanism, but fights at the same time with fully equal effect the whole ancient church. The points on which it expends mainly its indignation, or ridicule, or scorn, are to a great extent distinctive, not of modern Romanism as such, but of the church as it has existed back to the fourth century, if not indeed to the first part of the second. The argument goes too far, and proves a great deal too much. It becomes immediately profane, by

striking at all that has been esteemed most holy for the faith of christians, not simply in the middle ages, but in the ages also that went before. It turns the fathers into knaves and fools. It covers all ecclesiastical antiquity with disgrace. This is more than any sound mind, imbued with the slightest tinge of right historical feeling, can be expected patiently to endure. It is infidelity pretending to preach to us in the name of evangelical religion. If anti-popery is to be at the same time anti-christianity, in this blind irreverent style, the less we have to do with it the better. No such zeal for Protestantism can be entitled to any sort of respect. It carries the evidence of its own impotency on its very front. To have any knowledge of the past, and to perceive at all the organic continuity that must necessarily hold in the life of the church from age to age, through all transformations and changes, involves at once the clear perception also that this vulgar feeling towards Romanism is from beneath and not from above. We need not be slavishly bound by the authority of the past; but as believers in the divine reality of the church, we must consider it one of our first duties to treat its ancient history with reverence and respect. We may not join hands here with Ham, the father of Canaan. Those who do so, and who thus make Christianity vile, while they pretend to be spitting only upon the errors and superstitions of Rome, prove by this very fact that they are blind witnesses and teachers even in regard to Romanism itself. Whatever may be wrong here, *they* are not the men whom it is safe to follow as guides and leaders into a better way. They do not understand what they condemn. There is neither light nor love in their zeal. If our war against Romanism is to be so managed that it must be at the same time a war against all church antiquity, we may as well give up the contest. But to have any intelligent regard for the ancient church on the other hand, any feeling of religious fellowship with it, is to see that Romanism itself is no fair object for persecution in this radical and ribald style. We may oppose it still; but we will have some sense also of its just claims and merits. We will not spit upon it, nor cover it with spiteful and malignant slang. We will not feel, that love to Christ and hatred of the Pope are precisely one and the same thing.

But the future also comes in, through the medium of a right historical feeling, along with the past, to promote this same equitable and moderate tone of thought towards the Catholic church. To have faith in Protestantism at all as a development out of Catholicism, (the only view that allows any real faith in it what-

ever,) is to feel at the same time that it is not in and of itself the last full result of the process to which it owes its birth; that it has not carried away with it the *whole* life of the church as it stood before; that what it lacks accordingly in this respect, can only be made up to it hereafter in some way from the other side of Christianity, as the same is still extant in the church of Rome. The actual course of history is proving this, for all thinking men, more and more. Protestantism, as it now stands, is not the end of the Reformation. Who will dare to say of it, that any one of its sects separately, or that all of its sects collectively, may be taken for the full and whole sense of the holy catholic church, the original mystery of the creed? It is but too plain, that it falls far short of the proper idea of this mystery. The sect system, say what we may of it, is constitutionally at war with the true being of the church, and tends always towards its dissolution. It can never stand therefore as a fixed and ultimate fact, in the history of Christianity. If it be required in the progress of this history at all, it can only be for the sake of some ulterior order in which it is destined finally to pass away; and so, no system in which it is comprehended can ever be enduring, under any such form. In the case of Protestantism, this constitutional instability is now a simple matter of fact which has become too plain to be denied. The system is not fixed, but in motion; and the motion is for the time in the direction of complete self-dissolution. Fools and bigots may shut their eyes, to the truth; but it is none the less clear for all this to such as are earnestly thoughtful and truly wise. The fashion of this system passeth away. We can have no rational faith in it then as an abiding order, but only as we take it for a transitory scheme, whose breaking up is to make room in due time for another and far more perfect state of the church, in which its disorders and miseries shall finally be brought to an end. But to feel this, with any sense of the historical rights of the ancient church, and with any apprehension of what the Roman communion still is as distinguished from the Protestant, is to see and feel at the same time that the new order in which Protestantism is to become thus complete cannot be reached without the co-operation and help of Romanism. However faulty this may be in its separate character, it still embodies in itself nevertheless certain principles and forms of life, derived from the past history of the church, which are wanting to Protestantism as it now stands, and which need to be incorporated with it in some way as the proper and necessary complement of its own nature. The interest of Romanism is not so left behind, as to be no longer of

any account; it must come in hereafter to counterbalance and correct again the disorder and excess of the other system. To this issue it comes necessarily, we say, with the historical scheme now under consideration.

The issue itself however may be conceived of as coming to pass in different ways, accordingly as greater or less stress is laid on one or the other of the factors concerned in its production.

First, Protestantism may be taken for the grand reigning stream of Christianity, (though not the whole of it by any means.) into which finally the life of Catholicism is to pour itself as a wholesome qualifying power, yielding to it the palm of superior right and strength.

Or secondly, the two forces may be viewed as contrary sides merely of a dialectic process, in the Hegelian sense, which must be both alike taken up and so brought to an end (*aufgehoben*) in a new form of existence, that shall be at once the truth of both and yet something far higher and better than either.

Or lastly, it may be supposed that the principal succession of the proper church life lies after all in the channel of the Roman Catholic communion; while Protestantism is to be regarded still as a true outflow of the same life, legitimate and necessary in its time, which however must in the end fall back into the old Catholic stream in order to fulfil its own mission, bringing into the universal church thus a new spiritual tone which only such a crisis could enable it to reach.

Of these three hypotheses, the first of course falls in best with the natural presumption of all Protestants in favor of their own system. But so far as the vindication of Protestantism itself is concerned, on the scheme of historical development, it would hold good under any of the views now mentioned; for even the last implies the necessity of its presence, and the reality of its vocation, as a vast and mighty factor in the work by which the church is to be made finally complete. It is no part of our business now, however, to discuss the merits either of all or of any of these hypothetical constructions; what we have in view is simply to show, how the general historical view here in question, by which Protestantism is seen to be in its very nature a movement towards something more complete than its present state, and something which is to be reached only in the direction of Catholicism, must necessarily beget towards the Roman church a much more tolerant and favorable feeling than that which usually actuates the enemies of this communion.

We know well, what sort of offence some are likely to take with any statement of this kind. They count it for no small

part of their righteousness, to hate the Roman Catholic church with a perfect hatred ; and they are ready to make it a grievous heresy in others, if they fall not in at once with this want of charity, or presume to take any view of the case that is less intolerant than their own. We have only to say however, that *we* have not so learned Christ ; and we know of no reason why we should passively succumb to the authority of any such arbitrary and intemperate spirit. It is no article of faith with us, no term of orthodoxy, to believe that the Pope as such is Antichrist, that the Roman church is Babylon, that a certain scheme of exegesis or a certain construction of church history, brought in to prop up this view, is to be received as of one and the same force with the authority of God's word itself. We have yet to learn, by what right any pretend to set up their exegetical or historical hobbies in such shape, the shibboleths at best of a mere party, for the universal law of Protestantism and the only measure of its faith. We claim for ourselves, and for all Protestants, the exercise here of some independent thought, and full liberty to judge of this whole subject as the case itself may seem to require. It is high time indeed, that the school to which we now refer should itself begin to see, that its Procrustean rule here is one that cannot stand. Anti popery, in this absolutely radical and unhistorical style, is not the whole and only true sense of Protestantism. Its fanatical war-whoop belongs to the outskirts of this camp at best, and not to its proper centre. The best Protestant piety, and we may say the entire Protestant learning, of the present time, fall not in at all with any such senseless yell, but stand in doubt of it more and more as being too often of the very same sound with open infidelity itself. Philology and history are working now mightily against this narrow school, all over the world, and not at all in its favor. Its only strength lies in its determination to ignore and resist, as it best can, the progress of true theological science. But this must soon prove also a crumbling trust. Historical studies in particular are already fast undermining its foundations, by the new trains of thought they are forcing on the mind of the world. The actual course of events too in our own age, is full of ominous meaning in the same direction.

Certain it is, that the present especially is no time for yielding tamely to the madness of any spirit, that seeks to build up Protestantism as the work of God, by denouncing Catholicism as purely and wholly the work of the Devil. Never before perhaps was the principle of unbelief so actively at work in the nominally christian world, for the overthrow of religion under

every supernatural view. To make the matter worse, this principle is affecting to be itself the deepest and last sense of Christianity, the true end of its high and glorious mission for the redemption of the human race. Here undoubtedly we meet the real Antichrist of the present age, in a form that may well fill the world with apprehension and dread. It is at once rationalism (with the sect spirit) in the church, and radicalism in the state. Against this formidable enemy, the cause of Protestantism and the cause of Romanism are one and the same; and we be to us as Protestants, if we refuse to see and acknowledge the fact. To make Romanism itself infidelity, to deride its supernatural pretensions, to treat its mysteries as diabolical and profane, and to own no fellowship with its faith whatever, (in the common anti-popery style,) is almost unavoidably to come to a sort of truce at least, if not indeed open friendship, with the real infidelity to which it stands opposed, and that is now notoriously making war upon it in precisely the same form and fashion. It is a sad spectacle in truth, when any part of the Protestant church is seen smiling on the enemies of all religion, and even cheering them forward it may be in their work of destruction, simply because it is directed immediately against the church of Rome, as though *any* opposition to this were at once a service rendered to the other side. According to this style of thinking, it would be a gain for the cause of religion if Romanism were at once swept, by some sudden revolution, from the face of the earth, even if open infidelity for the time should be left in its place.' Shall we join hands with those who thus think and

¹The want of spiritual discernment here with many Protestants is truly amazing. They are ready to bid God speed to any agency, however low and vile, that is turned against the Catholic church. Every vagabond that sets up the trade of abusing the Pope, finds some favor. Ronge, a few years since, was at once hailed as a second Luther, though his whole cause now lies in the gutter of infidelity. And how was Giustiniani lauded for his work, in getting up German churches of the same stamp in our own country. There is a fearful tendency among us even to make common cause with the revolutionary spirit in Europe, under its worst forms, just because it seeks to destroy priests as well as to put down kings. True, we all condemn Rationalism and Socialism in the abstract; but we are wonderfully prone notwithstanding to look upon the cause in which they are enlisted as in itself a very good cause, which it becomes us as Republicans and Protestants to cheer and help. The cry of liberty and social rights deceives us. It becomes part of our religion to pray for the success of every revolution got up in the name of freedom, whatever else may be its merits. We fall in with the cant and slang of humanitarian patriotism on this subject, as though it were the true sense of Christ's blessed evangel; and are

talk? God forbid. They are traitors to the cause of Protestantism, if this be indeed the cause of true Christianity. We abhor every such unholy alliance as is here offered to our view. We go with Rome against Infidelity, a thousand times more readily than with Infidelity against Rome. We are very sure too, that any Protestant feeling which is differently constituted at this point, must be throughout miserably defective and false. It proceeds on a wrong apprehension altogether of the true relation between Protestantism and Romanism; it stands in no sympathy or fellowship whatever with the Catholic life of other ages; it shows itself to be wanting thus in a material element of Christianity itself. Plume itself as it may on its own worth, it is of counterfeit quality in its very nature. Its elective affinities prove it to be false.

We now bring these articles to a close. In the way of general recapitulation, our whole subject may be exhibited in the following propositions.

1. It is an error to suppose, that Nicene Christianity as it existed in the fourth and fifth centuries was in any sense identical with modern Protestantism. It was in all material respects the same system that is presented to us in the later Roman church.

2. It is an error to suppose, that the Christianity of the second century, as we find it in the time of Irenæus or even in the days of Ignatius and Polycarp, was of one and the same order with modern Protestantism. Especially was it unlike this in the Puritan form. However it may have differed from the Nicene system, it was made up of elements and tendencies plainly which looked towards this all along as their logical end. It was the later system at least in principle and germ.

3. The difference which exists in the whole case turns not merely on any single outward institution, such as episcopacy, but extends to the ecclesiastical life as a whole. It is a vain pretence therefore, by which Anglicanism affects to be on this score a true and full copy of what the church was in the first

prepared then to denounce every voice that refuses to take up the same song, as false to the genius of America. Such religious papers as the N. Y. Observer make common chime here with the Tribune and Herald of the same city; and the very pulpit rings in many cases, with no uncertain sound, in the same direction. But what can be more shallow than all this? Europe may need reform; no doubt does need it greatly. But how idle is it to look for anything of this sort, from the revolutionary spirit that is now bent on overturning its governments and institutions? To expect the regeneration of society from any such spirit, is itself a species of infidelity not to be excused.

ages. The universal posture and genius of the ancient church, its scheme of thought and modes of action, were different. Its life was constitutionally Catholic and not Protestant.

4. No scheme of Protestantism then can be vindicated, on the ground of its being a repristination simply of what Christianity was immediately after the age of the Apostles.

5. On the other hand however, to pretend that this post-apostolical Christianity was in no view the legitimate continuation of the New Testament church, but a full apostacy from this in principle from the very start; so that Protestantism is to be considered a new fact altogether, rooting itself in the bible, without any regard to history; is such an assumption, as goes to upset completely the supernatural mystery of the holy catholic church, in the form under which it is made to challenge our faith in the Apostles' Creed. To take away from the church its divine historical existence, is to turn it into a wretched Gnostic abstraction. To conceive of it as the mere foot-ball of Satan from the beginning, is to suppose Christ either totally unmindful of his own word that the gates of hell should not prevail against it, or else unable to make his word good. No theory can stand, which thus overthrows the truth of the church from the beginning.

6. Protestantism then, if it is to be rationally vindicated at all on the platform of faith, must be set in union with the original fact of Christianity through the medium of the actual history of this fact, as we have it in the progress of the old Catholic church from the second century down to the sixteenth. It must be historical, the product of the previous life of the church, in order to be true and worthy of trust. Whatever line of sects it may be possible to trump up on the outside of the church proper, down to the time of the Waldenses, it is well known that Protestantism was not derived from any such poor source in fact; and one of the greatest wrongs that can well be done to it, is to seek its apology in any such jejune and hollow succession. If it be not the genuine fruit of the best life that belonged to the old church itself, as Luther and his compeers believed, it can admit of no valid defence.

7. This however involves of necessity the idea of historical development; by which both Romanism and Protestantism are to be regarded as falling short of the full idea of Christianity, and as needing something beyond themselves for their own completion.

8. No opposition to Romanism can deserve respect, or carry with it any true weight, which is not based on some proper sense of its historical relations to early Christianity and to modern

Protestantism, in the view now stated. Without this qualification, anti-popery becomes altogether negative and destructional towards the Roman church, and is simply blind unhistorical radicalism of the very worst kind. Its war with Romanism, is a rude profane assault in truth upon all ecclesiastical antiquity. No such controversy can stand. History and theology must in due time sweep it from the field.

J. W. N.

ZWINGLI AS A COMMENTATOR.

WE propose, in the present, and perhaps one or two future Nos. of the Review, to furnish some selected specimens, of the character and qualities of the great Reformer, named above, as an expounder of the word of God. If even the briefest epistle, or most casual saying, that proceeded from the pen or lips, of this deservedly venerated instrument in the hands of God, in the deliverance of His Church from the bondage of superstitions and errors which Popery had forced upon it, is eagerly seized upon and studied with interest, how much more valuable, and worthy of consideration must not be the results of his calm inquiries and prayerful investigations of the holy word of God? These annotations must, moreover, acquire increased interest for us, in consideration of the supreme importance attached by this Reformer, in common with all his coadjutors to the Holy Scriptures, regarding them, "as handed down to us in the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, as the pure and proper source, as well as the only certain measure, of all saving faith." —(*Principle of Prot. Translated by Dr. Nevin*).

As first specimens, we present selections from the notes upon the Gospel of Matthew, written in Latin, as indeed he wrote every thing intended for private or scientific use. These notes doubtless formed the basis of the Lectures delivered by Zuingli upon this Gospel, immediately after his settlement in Zurich. The footnotes are additions, for which we are indebted to the diligence and love of one of Zuingli's dearest friends, Leo Juda.

The edition of his works before us, is that of Schuler and Schulthess, recently published in Zurich. In the text the version of Zuingli is given, for obvious reasons, in preference to the original, or the English translation.

Annotations of Ulric Zwingli, upon the Gospel of Matthew.

CHAPTER I.

Gospel signifies good tidings. By the eating of Adam we all became children of wrath; that is to say, from a sinner sinners are born. We were all the adversaries and enemies of God. But the cause of this enmity between God and ourselves was sin. And there was no one who could reconcile us to God, because we were all sinners, and were all obnoxious to the same guilt. In compassion for us God sent his only begotten Son into

the world, that being invested with our frail flesh, he might deliver us by his death, and restore us to the favor of God. He who was conceived by the Holy Ghost is born of a Virgin, and at length voluntarily offers himself for us in death to the Father, as an expiation for our sins. Of this immense benefit bestowed by God through Christ, the Gospel is declared to be the announcement and proclamation.

There is moreover, a twofold justice: one of God, being that which He approves, and which can stand before God; another of men, namely that which we claim for ourselves by living innocently and honestly before men. But however great this may have been, it would never be able to stand before God, who is the highest, eternal and purest Good, for He is an eternal and most pure fire, with whom nothing can remain, that is contaminated. But there is none among men, however just, who is without a spot, even though he may have cultivated righteousness with the greatest care. We must utterly despair therefore of our own righteousness before God, however perfect it may have been, so that distrusting it, we may flee as suppliants to the compassion and the grace of God displayed in Christ. For God gave to us His Son, that he might be our all. He will be our righteousness and innocence before God. In him we may trust, to him we may cleave with firm faith. If we receive this immense favor with a believing heart, then truly we acknowledge God, as our most gracious Father. This transports and inflames our heart with joy and love: Him we desire to please, and walk in innocence before His presence, above all taking heed lest we ever should offend this most benignant Father, bearing patiently, and with a calm mind whatever of joy or adversity this loving Father may dispense. This is the righteousness of faith, which God approves, and which can stand before the eyes of God.

Verse 1. The title of this gospel is, *Liber generationis Jesu Christi filii David, etc.* That is, this book sets forth how Christ became a man, and was born of a virgin-mother, which generation is traced through a line of most noble patriarchs and kings.

That Matthew was called from being a tax gatherer to the Apostleship and office of an Evangelist, affords an illustrious example of the divine compassion and clemency. For among all vices none hinders a man more from attaining to the knowledge of the true God, than the love of money. This calls the

mind away from God, and involves it wholly with the affairs of this life.'

V. 18. *Quum desponsata.* This espousal was entered into before the angel Gabriel came to her. According to the custom therefore she was an espoused virgin. But meanwhile God disposes of her case otherwise, so that she becomes a mother without the seed of a man, by the power of the Holy Ghost, so that he who was conceived in her, and born of her, was the Son of God. Here it is to be observed, that God disposes and modifies all our counsels, and all our actions according to His good pleasure, even though we sometimes may resolve to pursue a contrary course. From this we learn also, that the pretended chastity of the Vestal virgins (which is ever celebrated and common among us), was by no means esteemed among the Jews. That there were vestal virgins among the heathen is unquestionably well known to all, but in a very different manner from that which our monks report. For they were educated under an honest discipline in some definite place, until they reached nuptial years, and then were espoused. If Mary truly remained a perpetual virgin, do not make it rashly an example, which you may seek to imitate, unless you have been called and chosen to it, by a special revelation. Among all mortals this one alone was chosen to this state, that with a pure and untouched body, she might bear Christ the Son of God, and might be a mother without the laying off of her virginity and chastity. This privilege is granted to no other creature. It will be for us therefore to respect and live according to the appointment of God, being in due time united in matrimony, unless we should be assured that God has otherwise resolved concerning us. Neither should you say. Christ did not take unto himself a wife, therefore I will not marry; for the cases are altogether different. It was indeed proper that he, who was true man, and yet at the same time true and eternal God, should not be joined with any one in marriage. Nevertheless meanwhile, in commendation of matrimony, he desires to be born of an espoused mother. Christ is truly to be an example for our life, although there are features

¹ *Liber generationis.*—The title is according to the Hebrew style. This is the book in which is contained a history of the catalogue of Christ; a history of the family of Christ, wie er von einem vater an den andern geboren sy, das geschlecht Christi.

David filius.—Christ is called the son of David because the promise given to David was more recent than that given to Abraham; for great promises were made to each.

in his life which do not pertain to ours. It is permitted us to imitate his virtues, obedience, humility, modesty, patience, gentleness, his great charity and beneficence; after the perfections of divinity it is not lawful for mortals to reach.

Priusquam congressi.—That is to say, before the virgin had been received into the house of her husband, before they had come to dwell in one home, the husband observes that his wife is pregnant. At first he does not understand this mystery, but afterwards learns it from the angel. He perceives that she is with child, and yet not by him, for he had never known her; wherefore he meditates putting her away. But having been taught by the angel, he changes his mind. And upon this hinge turns the christian faith, that we believe Christ the Son of God to have been truly conceived in the womb of the virgin, without the seed of man, by the power of the Holy Ghost.²

V. 20. *In somnio.*—Dreams, by which God may think proper to reveal and manifest something unusual to us, may nevertheless be natural, although something occurs in them which is beyond the common course of dreams, God thus ordering it for the sake of his elect. For in divine light the visions of God become most clear and indubitable. In such God so shows us his will, that we can be in no doubt concerning it. Not of this sort are the dreams of the Cata-baptists; who dream to themselves certain revelations and visions, when there are none. What we say concerning dreams, we wish also to be understood of visions (*vigiliis*); for in these also God may appear to his people, and manifest his will.³

V. 22. *Porro hoc totum.*—When the prophet speaks, God speaks, for he is the instrument of God. Not that God needs instruments. For in this the similitude fails. God does not *need* instruments, but *uses* them: whereas man can do nothing without organs. But God makes use of his creatures not on his but upon our account. Whenever therefore we are the instruments of God, it happens that God sometimes ascribes to us, what is his work alone, and not that of any creature. We might ad-

² *Congressi.*—It is also an article of our faith, that Christ was conceived in the womb of Mary not after a human manner, but by the Holy Ghost.

Infamare.—See the scholia of Erasmus: to expose her, to make her an example; he was unwilling that she should be slain according to the law, Deut. 27. It is said here of adultery, of the lascivious wantonness of virgins.

³ *In somnio.*—Note: Here you may show, what and of what kind are divine visions, or manifestations of the divine mind and will, which are made most clear to us (as above) by the light of God.

duce examples of this from daily occurrences. One says: my horse brought me this wood for the winter's use. But what could the horse do, without his master as leader and guide. Thus Christ says to his apostles, "whose sins ye remit, are remitted unto them:" whereas no one can remit sins, but God alone. If therefore man, elated by this indulgence and favor of God, flatters himself with the conceit that he is the author of that which God has bestowed, whereas he is only the instrument, he does so most wickedly, and shall not escape with impunity. For he robs God of His glory, and does not act otherwise, than if the clay should say to the potter: 'Thou hast not made me: or, I have formed myself. A prophet therefore ought to speak as sent by God, and in God's name reprove sinners, not in his own. Neither may he teach his own opinions, nor seek his own glory or gain.'

V. 23.—*Ecce virgo*.—It behooved Christ to be born of a virgin pure and undefiled, seeing that he was to be the purifier of all men.

Emmanuel.—This being interpreted signifies, God with us. For God to be with us requires, that he should be intimately and peculiarly present with us, truly ours. Wherefore he becomes like one of us. This awakens confidence in us towards Him. Neither is the name Emmanuel opposed to the name Jesus. For Jesus is the Saviour, the mighty God, who, in this form comes to us, and serves us. The import of each word therefore is the same. The most excellent God comes to us that he may serve us, that he may be our salvation: the prophet describes Christ by a circumlocution. To be with us, or to be ours, is to be our Saviour, our Father, as the father of a family.⁶

V. 25. *Donec peperit*.—In the meditation of divine things, during the consummation of the holy union, we must have regard as well to the spirit as to the letter. For in controversies concerning the scriptures, (which may arise), we should yield obedience to the spirit, as the guide and master of the letter, and observe diligently whatever he may dictate, not pertinaciously adhering to the letter against the decision of the Spirit, much

⁶ *Nomen ejus Jesus*.—The reason why he is called Jesus is annexed by the evangelist, when he says: He shall save, &c. See excerpta Mark 12. For Jesus is both Saviour and mighty God, because He comes to us not to oppress us with new laws, but that he might redeem us from the tyranny of the law, which appears more fully from what follows.

⁶ *Emmanuel*.—Note: The manner in which Christ becomes our salvation and expiation, is indicated by the etymology of his name.

less opposing the Spirit to the Scriptures. The scriptures agree with the Spirit. But I speak of our spirit of faith, which, unless held in with bits and cords soon petulantly and fiercely breaks away from all proper restraints (*extra charum et organum effertur*.) Thus our spirit, taught and imbued by the heavenly and divine spirit, becomes conformed to the scriptures. That which is written therefore is the touchstone of our spirit. By this our spirit must be tried. Helvidius therefore errs upon the word—*Donec*: for he does not perceive the usage of the scriptures. For *Donec* is not simply exclusive, neither does it limit a certain time, but extends even beyond indefinitely. This can be seen in Isaiah 42nd, chapter, where the Prophet says: He will lead forth judgement unto truth, *until* he have set judgement in the earth. He does not fix the time, but shows that Christ should reign perpetually with judgement and justice. Thus also Ps. 109—*until* I make mine enemies. What hast thou to say O Helvidius! Will Christ not sit, after the judgement, at the right hand of the Father? But what will follow, if your opinion remains? Far be so impious a thought from the minds of the faithful. Thus also 2 Peter 1, until the day dawns. The evangelist therefore wishes to assert by this, that she remained a virgin after she had brought forth her child. For if she had been a virgin only before the birth, what was the meaning of the prophet's sign by which this future event was predicted, seeing that it is only a matter of daily occurrence, that virgins bring forth children, but in begetting them, do not remain virgins? The prophet as well as the evangelist therefore wish to designate something altogether peculiar and extraordinary.*

CHAPTER II.

V. 1. *Quum natus esset*.—In this chapter the Lord illustrates those prophecies, which He had previously foretold, concerning the rejection of the Jews, and the calling of the Gentiles. For these Magi, to whom the Lord manifests the birth of His Son, are the first-fruits of the Gentiles. That they came on the

* *Donec peperit*.—The dispute of Helvidius is a fruit of the flesh, and of vain glory.

Donec.—They err with Helvidius about this word “donec,” who say, that Joseph knew his wife Mary after the birth of Christ, because they do not perceive that “donec,” embraces future and subsequent time.

Primogenitum.—The Hebrews do not call him first-born, who is born chief among many, but him who opens his mother's womb, as in Ex. 13.

twelfth day after the birth of Christ, or that they were three kings, does not appear from the sacred scriptures, neither is it very probable. This notion seems however to have sprung from a pagan custom. For the sixth day of January was sacred among the Romans, as occurring in the Saturnian festival. This foolish notion therefore comes from Rome. It is possible to discover this also in the Kalends, by a permutation of feasts: at best, they savor of a relationship. It is evident therefore, that Roman Pontiffs, can make but small capital out of the affair. For where there is a true knowledge of God and of the Christian Religion, the mind is not disturbed by such external things, in reference to which it has liberty. The ancients, influenced by wiser reasons, institute here another feast, celebrating the Epiphany, that is the exhibition of a supernatural apparition. For the Father appears under the form of a voice, the Son in the flesh, and the Holy Ghost under the form of a dove. They thus commemorate at the same time, the Baptism of Christ, and the advent of the Magi. The Magi were the wise men of the Persians, *wyse gelerte lüt*. As they were most skilled in astrology, God communicates with them by means of stars, leading them by means of a miraculous star to the knowledge of His Son. By the star they are led to the door of his dwelling, within they are truly enlightened. They judge, conjecture that some great and powerful king has arisen in Judea, partly from the appearance of the star, and partly perceive it by Divine illumination.¹

V. 3. *Turbatus Herodes*.—Those who are great and mighty in the earth, cannot well endure to have Christ proclaimed, and the glory of God exhibited. For Christ is integrity, is virtue, is humility, is truth. They on the contrary are enemies of justice, wicked, given to vices and crimes, haughty, false.

Et omnis Hierosolyma cum illo.—The hypocrites desire to flatter the impious king: although therefore they hate Herod worse than an adder, they still pretend to condole with the cruel tyrant, whose violence and tyranny, had they been honest and

¹ *Stellam*—A wonderful vision or apparition: ein seltsam ungehört lystion hat er inder ergeygt erscheinen lassen. They were skilled in the science of the stars, but did not know what to make of this one. By this sign they are led to the door of Christ's abode, and then finding themselves more brightly illuminated within, they regard the wonder as a sign and index of some great event, of the birth namely of some illustrious personage in Judea, which they partly conclude from the appearance of the star, and in part also perceive by the direct instruction of God. Note: Justin Lib. 2., and many others, tells us who first invented the magic arts, and studied most carefully the motion of the stars.

sincere men, it had become them to resist. They consequently must be esteemed the worst men, who flatter so wicked a tyrant, instead of withstanding him, and they are worthy of our regard who are oppressed by his tyranny.²

V. 6. *Exhibit ex te dux.*—From thee shall be born and proceed a governor of my chosen people. For Christ is the way and the door by which we come to God. Christ is the head of His people.

V. 7. *Accurate.*—The wicked observe times and occasions most carefully, that they may do the more harm. For in this matter the children of this generation by far excel the children of light. They carefully devise the snares and schemes of doing mischief, and conceal the whole beneath a pretext of piety. For here the king feigns a desire to find the child Jesus that he may worship him, whom he has already resolved to kill, and against whom he is most cruelly enraged.³

Illusus a magis.—The Magi, as above noted, were wise men, skilled in astrology and other mysteries. When men of this character are entrusted with the management of public affairs, the nations prosper: Neither are any republics ever more happily governed, than when managed by wise men.

V. 9. *Quam viderant in oriente*—Their country was east of Jerusalem. A star leads these kings; for us the light of divine truth is leader of the way. But we, absorbed too often with present cares, do not perceive this brilliant torch. We are like children, who collect pebbles of various colors, and give them various names, calling them gold, and silver, and gems, &c. Thus do the avaricious, and the lovers of this world: one brings marble from afar, another admires gold. In this however they act more foolishly than children, because their frivolous estimate is less consistent with their years. Let the mind therefore

² *Tota Hierosolyma.*—Note: Thus in our day some are unwilling to gratify cruel Tyrants, but do not resist their violence; whence it is evident that those are the worst, who do not withstand the wicked efforts of these wretches, and they are deservedly oppressed with the tyranny of such Tyrants.

³ *Adorem cum.*—Note: Here we must strongly condemn those knaves as most base and abominable, who say one thing with their mouth, but in their heart are plotting and meditating the opposite.—Note: Here you may with propriety touch upon the folly of the avaricious, for they resemble silly children, who gather small stones of various colors, and give them particular names; thus with the covetous and voluptuous, one admires gold, another prefers strong drink, and another loves luxury. From these things our minds should turn away, and beholding this star should follow it.

be withdrawn from things present, and the eye be turned to heavenly things, that fixed upon that star we may follow it. Then we may well endure to be called only fools, provided we are not worthlessly wicked, and obnoxious to all kinds of vices and crimes.

V. 10. *Gavisi sunt.*—Those who come to the knowledge of God, experience great joy and comfort in their souls. Then are opened unto them the treasures of faith, and they are prepared to do and suffer with a joyful mind, whatever things, even the most grievous, may happen to them for Christ's sake, and the truth.⁴

N. 13. *Ecce angelus domini.*—Christ flees to Egypt, and there engages most earnestly in the first battle fought for us. Let us carefully ponder this in our hearts, that Christ the Son of God, was for our sakes exposed to all manner of evils. It was not enough for Him to be our brother, having assumed our frailty, but he is also compelled to quit his own country and flee into a foreign land, and dwell an exile there.⁵

V. 15. *Ex Aegypto vocari.*—The calling of Israel from Egyptian captivity, was a figure of the calling of Christ from Egypt.

V. 16. *Tunc videns Herodes sibi illusum.*—Thus when the wicked see that they can effect nothing against the truth, and find their intentions frustrated, they become more enraged, and exercise all manner of cruelty against the good, so that not even the most eloquent tongue can describe the cruelties they inflict. Some one may say: What need was there for Christ, who was God, to flee into Egypt? Why did He not slay the tyrant? I answer, that it is impious to inquire into the reasons of the divine will, and altogether unworthy a true believer. But inasmuch as the carnal nature even of believers, often annoys them with curiosity in reference to divine things, and they persist in prying into them, we may say something to quiet it. Paul shows that Christ desired to be made like unto us in all things, Heb. 4.

⁴ *Aurum, Thus.*—See the prophecy of Isaiah chap. 60, where it is predicted that the Gentiles should come to Christ and offer unto Him their choicest treasures, themselves, and all their best affections. (See Comment. in loc.) Note: By silver and gold may be understood that which is choicest and best in us, namely love towards God and our neighbor. Note: These gifts they lay before Him the King Almighty and Immortal, who by His own death procured immortality for us.

⁵ *Fugit in Egyptum.*—Here is an opportunity for consoling those who have left their home and country for Christ's sake, because they shall be rewarded an hundred-fold.

Whatever things therefore are most oppressive and painful for man to bear, Christ first took upon himself. It is hard for us to endure poverty, but Christ was born in poverty. It is hard for us to bear exile and banishment, to be driven from our homes, but this rough yoke Christ bore in his infancy. If you say: His parents were poor and obscure, so that his misfortune was less grievous. Nay the poorer they were, the more painful his trials. For the rich have the means of procuring comforts, of supplying that which they may lack. It is hard for us to suffer reproach, Christ was loaded with the greatest contumely. For what is more infamous than to be likened to robbers, nay to be suspended between robbers, and the chief of them? His name was blasphemed with the most shameful railleries. All this he suffered for us, in his own body, that we might see the greatness of His love. But when we at times do any thing, how apt we are to seek our own interest. Christ did all for us, nothing for his own gain, or glory, for He needed nothing.⁶

V. 17. *Tunc impletum*.—A great weeping and complaint is heard, far and wide, on account of the Babylonian captivity. It indicates the great affliction of the captives. Rachel deploring her children, must be understood, by synecdoche, of all Israel. Rachel was Joseph's mother, and Joseph is frequently put for Israel. Those who remain in the land of Israel, mourn on account of those who are led away captive, and the whole land is filled with their wailing. The evangelist applies these words to Christ: for all things reported in the Old Testament as actual occurrences, were done figuratively, and are figures of things finding their true fulfilment and consummation in Christ. That which had previously happened in Israel, and was fulfilled according to the prophecy of Jeremiah, is now finally and most truly accomplished in Christ. The facts of the O. T. are not facts alone, but also figures. Take an example: Jacob's contest with the angel, was a real occurrence, also that he had two wives, &c. But this was also prefigurative of Christ to come, who betrothed to himself both Jews and Gentiles in one church; the figure is thus fulfilled in Christ, and that at length is accomplished which had previously happened with Jacob. A true prophecy differs therefore from the foretelling of an event by means of a figurative past; both are variously fulfilled.⁷

⁶ *Tam Herodes*.—Note: Thus do Tyrants rage at this day, exercising all manner of cruelty against prophets, and other faithful servants of the Lord.

⁷ *Rachel plorans*.—Note: The evangelist refers this passage to Christ, and

V. 22. *Quum audisset Archelaus.*—The evangelist next shows how Christ came to be called a Nazarene, although He was a native of Bethlehem. If you ask, whether Archelaus was not to be feared in Galilee? I answer: after the Babylonian captivity there were other people in Galilee besides Jews and Israelites. He could therefore be more easily and safely hid in Galilee than in Judea, over which Archelaus reigned. But why did Joseph fear to return on his account, seeing that he everywhere enjoyed the presence and protection of the angel of the Lord, and was always directed by the voice of God? Joseph knows too well that all things occur under the control of the Divine Providence, if one is faithful. Was he able by his fear or by his own act, to change the purpose of Providence? These things are made to appear as though Joseph, by his own prudence, secures the child. The evangelist shows what is the office of men, and what it becomes every pious man to do. It becomes the careful to be also faithful; and the more such an one trusts in God, the more diligent and solicitous is he, to promote whatever he knows to be pleasing to God, and to shun and put out of the way whatever is known to be offensive to Him: not ignorant meanwhile, that he cannot do more than God wishes and ordains, who knows how to accomplish all in all. Thus God has constituted man, so that he may endeavor and do those things that are right and good, that he may be always anxious and diligent, and yet effect no more than God desires. An illustration is at hand. The husbandman diligently observes the season, and all its changes, observes the course of the moon, plows the earth, sows, harrows, &c. Nevertheless if God is not willing, nothing prospers; should it please God to punish us with a famine, all this labor would be in vain. And yet he does not cease his efforts. The earth gives not, only what God wills. Why then, (you say) does God command men to labor, seeing that He gives only as much as may be pleasing to Him? Because this is the good pleasure of the most wise, and just, and merciful Father, that among all other creatures, man should hold

says it was now fulfilled, not because the prophet had foretold it concerning Christ, but was so fulfilled that what had previously happened in Israel is now again repeated by the cruelty of Herod. For that this occurred, as it did, in the time of the captivity, happened that it might be a prefiguration of the murder of the children under Herod, and this figure the evangelist says was now fulfilled.—A prophecy is a different thing from a fact set forth in a figure, and they are differently fulfilled. E. g. Isaiah predicts that a virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son; it is a prophecy, for the fact was fulfilled even in his own time.

the place of those, who may know Him with their mind, and labor with their body. For man is formed for labor, as a bird for flying. And it pleased the Most High to form such a creature, who might partly equal the angels, in contemplating and knowing heavenly things with his spirit, and in part resemble beasts of burden, that is in his body. For if man could not labor, what would he be else than a swine? This we may clearly see in voluptuous and sluggish men, who delight in nothing but whoremongery and sensual indulgence, &c. Is there a father who does not enjoin exercise of some sort upon his son, although he might educate him without labor? Man therefore ought to do whatever belongs to his calling or position, meanwhile awaiting in faith whatever issue God may appoint.

V. 23. *Nazaraeus vocabitur*.—Nazareans were disciples of a certain class, who were trained to learning under a peculiar discipline, as is found in the books of Moses. Jerome derives the name from the flower *neser*: for Christ is the flower of Nazareth. Others prefer another explanation, supposing Him to be thus designated because He was set apart and educated for special learning and doctrine. It is certain, that this appellation was not given to Christ by accident or undesignedly, but according to some divine purpose. It is said, this was “spoken by the prophets,” no particular one being named, a method of reference not unusual.*

Elston, Pa.

J. H. A. B.

* *Nazarenus*.—Christ was a Nazarene, i. e. learned and educated in doctrine. You may see the learning and wisdom of Christ, in what Luke tells us He did in His twelfth year. Note: in reference to the phrase, “spoken before by the prophets,” that it is often used when no particular passage is cited, when the writer may nevertheless know, that it is found somewhere in the prophetic books; unless you prefer to understand the *law*, synecdochically, which is of frequent occurrence among Hebrew writers, and also occurs in the instructions of Christ: It is written in your law, He says, when that of which He spoke is not written in the law but in the prophets. Note: The evangelist here speaks of a singular custom of some Jews, on account of which they are called Nazareans, i. e. obliging, gentle, well-disciplined, abstinent, which custom was a figure and type of Christ, especially their peculiar devotion to God, and the manner in which they chasten the body. Thus Christ will be a Nazarene free from every spot, and with a character most completely disciplined. As if Matthew should say: do not wonder that He dwells in Nazareth, for He will be a Nazarene indeed, i. e. holy and religious. Note: If we are Christ's, we also will be Nazarenes.

THE RELATION OF MAN TO NATURE.¹

LET any one, gifted with a reverent and earnest spirit, a clear intellect, and a soul tremblingly alive to impression from all that is truly great and beautiful, walk forth among the works of creation, that still stand "glorious as at the first day"—let him gaze on the blue heaven that stretches over him, in boundless magnificence, "like the inverted hand of God"—let him extend his vision over the broad earth spread out beneath, with its lofty mountains, shooting heavenward peaks of snow and peaks of fire, its plains and its vallies, its rivers and its oceans, its islands and its continents, its icy North and its burning South, let him survey the countless generations of plants, that adorn the surface, from the creeping lichens and humble mosses of the arctic solitudes, to the majestic, luxuriant and profuse vegetation of the regions of the tropics—guided by the revelations of science, let him ponder over the myriad races of animals that people every nook and corner of this fair domain and swarm even in the cold depths of polar seas—let him contemplate the incessant play of forces as well on the smallest as on the grandest scale, and the restless activity of the almost infinite mass of ever-ending, ever-beginning life—and he cannot but be overwhelmed with a sense of awe and wonder—he cannot but feel that here lies a burden and mystery—that "the holy problem of the universe" is yet unsolved—that no Oedipus has yet arisen to give a full interpretation to the riddle. He only hears the voice of the Erd Geist in Faust—

" In Being's floods, in Action's storm
I walk and work—above, beneath,
Work and weave in endless motion!
Birth and death
An infinite Ocean;
A seizing and giving
The fire of the living:
'Tis thus at the roaring loom of Time I fly,
And weave for God the garment thou seest him by."

Vast and triumphant indeed are the achievements which modern science has made in every department of physical knowl-

¹ This article contains the substance of an address pronounced before the General Union Philosophical Society of Dickinson College in June last.

edge, and much of the darkness that has heretofore brooded over the face of nature has vanished before the light of her adventurous torch. With a zeal that never flags—an ardor that is never damped—and an eagle glance that is never satiate or weary she travels the whole world over again and again, the object of her search not the philosopher's stone, or the elixir of life, those strange chimeras of the alchemistic brain, but the *untold secret*. For this she clambers to the summits of the Andes and the Himalayas—for this she drops her sounding line into fathomless abysses—for this she directs her keel into perilous and unknown seas—for this she digs down into the chambers of the rocks and brings up the relics of an extinct creation, the hieroglyphs of the Almighty—for this she sifts and measures and weighs and compares, with patient toil, day after day and year after year. It is not the desire of gain or the advantage of any material interest that fills her with such extraordinary energy, but the love of truth and the half-conscious persuasion that every new discovery brings her nearer to the goal of her hopes. From an immense accumulation of facts and observations, gathered with incredible diligence from every clime and every shore, and subjected to the most rigid scrutiny she deduces, by a process of the broadest induction general principles and general laws. And the highest result of all her labors hitherto is the Cosmos of a Baron Humboldt. With a bold prophetic instinct seizing on the sublime idea of the unity of the creation, he has endeavored to reduce all known laws and principles to that unity and present a finished picture of the whole. But the attempt has not been successful, for the time is not yet. To advance, however, the idea, to delineate by the power of genius a few grand outlines, and announce the dawn of a brighter era in the future, when all that is dark and chaotic will disappear forever before the indomitable will and intellect of man, is glory enough.

If modern science had done nothing more than to destroy the reign of marvel and of magic it would still have accomplished a great work. In rude and primitive states of society the forms of things are discerned only through the misty twilight of ignorance and as the timid cow-boy passing at night-fall through a gloomy wood sees quiet stump and rock suddenly transformed into monstrous shapes, that threaten to devour him, so to them the phenomena of nature that come not within range of their daily experience are magnified out of all due proportion and ascribed to the agency of good or evil spirits. But now the wand of Science has broken both the terror and the charm of the old poetic superstitions. The veiling of the sun or moon

by eclipse has ceased to agitate the bosoms of beholders with fear. His thunder bolts are taken from the fist of Jupiter. The Oreads and the Dryads are driven from the shades of the forest. The Nymph has forsaken her fountain. The Phœnix lies buried in his own ashes never to rise again. The Genii have retired far beyond the ridges of Caucasus. The Gnomes have descended into deeper caverns and the "pert fairies and the dapper elves" no longer trip it o'er the moonlit green. The Ocean has been robbed of his mermaid and his kraken, and the penetrating sagacity of a Lyell resolves even the semi-apocryphal Sea Serpent into a giant species of shark. Thus science proves fatal to all these magical creations of Fancy, and leaves them no fixed dwelling-place on the land or in the sea. They survive only in the realms of fable or of song, and gradually losing their hold on the common mind, fade like spectres in the first beams of the morning.

Some there be, who maintain that the overthrow of the marvellous has shaken the faith of men in the divine and supernatural, in other words, that the study of nature leads directly to infidelity and materialism. This is a serious charge and no doubt true of certain individuals and certain periods. But that there is a necessity in the case were very hard to believe. Truth must be eternally one, and God's first revelation cannot be at war with his latest and his best. That a wide-spread dualism has come to prevail between physical science and philosophy, and the religion of Jesus Christ, which is the highest philosophy, in which all enigmas are at last to find their proper solution, is a matter for profound regret. Both are injured by the separation, for, in such a state of antagonism, science on the one side is compelled to grow more and more of the earth—Earthy, subdued, like the dyer's hand, to the complexion of that which it works in, while religion, on the other, must perforce assume a character more or less fantastical, magical, and unreal. Only by the union of the two—only by their true inward union and reconciliation, can the meaning of the world, the great end toward which all things are unconsciously striving and struggling, become clearly apparent.

By reason of the exalted position, which man occupies as the head of the lower creation, the centre toward whom all lines converge, including in himself all that is beneath, he stands the flower and crown of all, the high-priest and interpreter of nature, the medium through which the visible, external and transient passes over into the sphere of the invisible and eternal. He is the eye of nature, for all else is blind; he is the voice of

nature, for all else is dumb; he is the soul of nature, for all else is perishable and fleeting; he is the lord of nature, for supreme dominion is his noble birth-right—dominion in knowledge and in power; dominion in knowledge, in the fullest and deepest sense of that word—dominion in power, in the fullest and deepest sense of that word. “Yet do we not now see all things put under him,” but such is his high prerogative in virtue of an original grant from heaven.

And what creature so well fitted as he to bear, like Atlas, the whole world on his shoulders? Is he not linked to nature by ten thousand ties? By the material of his body—for he was fashioned out of the dust of the earth, and the same elements, that compose this glorious temple, with its rare symmetry, its thinking head, its feeling heart, and its skilful hand run in every stream, float in every breeze and crumble in every clod of the valley. And when the mystic cord that binds them together is unloosed do they not speedily revert to their primal condition? Most of the solid rocks that make up the crust of the globe were probably at one time constituent parts of living organisms—and the mould of generation upon generation of the offspring of Adam lies blended with the soil on which we daily tread, undistinguishable in use or appearance from the roughest mineral heaps.

And further, man is linked to nature by his organic constitution. The same blood, the same bone, the same nerves, the same tissues, the same organs, the same powers of voluntary motion and the same desires, under infinitely varied forms and modifications, are found throughout all gradations of the animal kingdom from the whale, “hugest that swim the ocean-stream” down to the minutest microscopic animalcule. Man’s body only differs in its more complex and perfect structure. He is brother therefore to the worm, The fish, the reptile, the bird, the beast are repeated in him—have lot and share in him. All this too can be safely affirmed without giving the slightest countenance to the Lamarckian theory of development so-called, which has been revived and ingeniously advocated in our day by Professor Oken and the author of the *Vestiges of Creation*. Development there indeed is, but development in the idea, by successive acts of creation, not by transmutation of species. Progression there indeed is, progression upward, both in the order of time, from the beginning on through long cycles of preceeding ages to the present historic period, and in the order of rank, for the oldest living beings as well as the most simple and the most distant point onward and upward, as types to the thing typified, and perishing as

types must, still point onward and upward, and to him, who could grasp the mighty idea, and take in the whole at one view the entire creation would appear like a solemn hymn—like some grand oratorio, which starting on a few low, faint notes, gradually gains strength and fullness, and swelling louder and louder, rolls on from harmony to height of harmony until it reaches its loftiest outburst and expression—"the diapason closing full in man."

Nor is man in the least degraded by being so near akin to the clod and to the worm, but invested rather with his true dignity. By reason of this very kinship nature fulfills toward him the kindest offices. He is cradled in her lap and first looks out upon her face, as upon the face of a mother, covered with smiles, like the roseate hues of morning. In the freshness of his childhood all things wear the livery of heaven. "Heaven lies above him in his infancy." From the earliest period of his existence nature ministers to him, and through innumerable channels pours in upon him the most blessed influences. By the glories of the sunset and the dawn, the light of stars, the enchanting landscape, the lapse of waters and the songs of birds, by all colors, motions, forms and sounds she awakens in the bosom of her earth born Son the slumbering principle of immortal life. *Thought* pushes out her wings and soars aloft—the *unfathomable wells of feeling* are deeply stirred within and rising overflow their bounds—the *will*, casting aside its fetters and restraints, from the rule of the individual passes forth to other and wider fields of conquest. At length he stands erect in proud self-consciousness and feels himself to be, not a thing or a brute, but a man, a person, a king—the sceptre of dominion in his hand, the crown of glory on his brow—the last and noblest birth of nature.

To trace back to their hidden sources the manifold natural influences by which the human mind is thus quickened, moulded and aided in the course of its development, were a task of no common magnitude. A mere hasty glance, by way of illustration, at the close and necessary connexion, which subsists between language and the external world is all that can now be given. The relation between language and thought is deep and vital. They spring forth together and partake of the same organic life; but no less intimate and deep is the relation between language and nature. The poor mortal, in whom the avenues of sight and hearing are closed up—whose sensations are blunted and benumbed, though his tongue move freely and his organs of speech be perfect is yet able to utter no articulate sound.

Cut off from all the cheerful works and ways of nature and of men, his soul, with all her vast capabilities of expansion, sits in a dark and silent prison, in a state of perpetual infancy, until the time come again, when the blind shall see and the deaf hear. But from the lips of him, whose senses are unclogged, whose communication with the outer world is pure and uninterrupted, roll streams of speech, eloquent with the glow of passion and rich in ideas as Pactolus in gold-dust and diamonds. Nature therefore is the inexhaustible fountain-head of language, which at first consists only of the names of single objects, but by analogy and resemblance these names either separately or in combination are extended to things seen and unseen. To mediate thus between nature and language is one of the most important functions of the poet. Endowed with vivid sensibility, he is more keen to discover such analogies and resemblances and more apt to invent new words and forms of expression. His figures and his symbols pass into current use. Language is enriched and the sphere of thought enlarged. Nor is the connexion between the symbol and the thing symbolized, casual or accidental, but the result of design—the effect of law. It might not be as well otherwise. When the poet likens a fair maiden to a *lily*, the beauty and the harmony of the comparison is instantly perceived and acknowledged even by the most uncultivated mind and the object and the idea are married henceforth and forever in thought and speech. And why, unless because an invisible reality finds its true symbol in the outward and sensible? “For every word we have,” says Carlyle, “there was such a man and a poet. The coldest word was once a glowing new metaphor, and bold questionable originality. Thy very *attention*, does it not mean an *attentio*, a *stretching-to*?” Fancy that act of the mind, which all were conscious of, which none had yet named—when this new poet first felt bound and driven to name it. His questionable originality, and new glowing metaphor, was found adoptable, intelligible; and remains our name for it to this day.” Let us now take as an eminent and final example, the word *spirit*, and examine particularly the object from which it is derived. The word is of Latin origin and means *breath* or *air*, as do also the corresponding terms in Greek and Hebrew, and it may be in other languages also. Air was one of the elements of the ancients and is still so styled in common parlance. The name is applied to the great ocean of gases, which swathes the earth as with a garment, filling up its deepest vallies and covering its highest mountain-tops—the element in which we move, and from which, in common with all animals and plants, we

drink, as from an inexhaustible fountain, the breath of life—the element, through which we are brought into contact with all the transcendent loveliness and grandeur of God's creation, both around us and far beyond among the world of stars—the scene and theatre of phenomena, none the less glorious because by reason of daily familiarity, we cease to regard them. Here rove the mysterious winds, that blow as they list, now gliding in soft and gentle currents, with scarce strength enough to rob the thistle of one plumed seed, or to lift the veil of beauty and fan her glowing cheek, and then again dancing in giant waltzes from Ura Major to the tropics,—on the sea, rolling up huge waves to wreck the frail bark of the mariner and on the land, scattering, as if in sport, to the four points of the compass, the dwellings of men and the lordliest trees of the forest—here gather the dark and solemn thunder clouds with their lightnings and their rainbows—here fall fruitful showers—here float fragrant odors—here the blessed light of heaven is dispersed and diffused to illuminate with equal splendor the palace of a king and the nest of a robin—here blaze gorgeous colors—the firmament wears the blue of the living sapphire and the evening sky hues of crimson and gold—and here too vibrate tones of exquisite music and the accents of the human voice, sweeter far and more powerful than the combined melody of instruments. Now what object can be found in the entire round of nature so well worthy to give a title to the immortal principle within and a name to beings of another world? Both are absolutely free, boundless, subtle, pure, invisible, mysterious in their coming and in their going, sustainers of life and connecting links between earth and heaven. The analogy cannot be accidental. But in many cases there is no need even of the intervention of language between the object and the idea. Art draws directly from nature and oftentimes expresses what mere language never could. Architecture, Sculpture, Painting and Music ask not the medium of words. So too in the sphere of religion, in the Holy Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the invisible and real grace of God is directly bound to external objects, chosen because of an inward concord and fitness. Thus it is that all nature is transfigured, and from the visible and transient passes over, through language, art, and the awful mysteries of religion into a higher world, which is, at bottom, the most real world of the two and the wealth, that humanity derives from nature, through those various channels, is beyond calculation.

And yet with all his immense stores of knowledge and unlimited means of culture, in no single instance, has any mere

man, however exalted, attained to a supreme understanding of the things that are made, or dominion over them. His confined birth-place, the circumstances that surround him in his early youth and give first impress and direction to his faculties, the discordant elements that meet him on every side, the weakness of his intellect, and the brief duration of his life, all tend to cramp and check his development—and though he longs after fulness of knowledge with an infinite and irrepressible longing—though by travel, books, and works of art, and the power of imagination he crosses his own threshold and the boundaries of his sensible horizon, in search after wisdom, yet must he ever fall far below the ideal standard. And so also in his mastery over the forces of nature. What though he can chain the forked lightning, rule the dashing waves, and ward off, with consummate skill, a host of terrible diseases, yet is he, all his life long, in a great measure, a slave to his senses, and must at last sink beneath the icy grasp of death.

But as all nature below points upward to man and finds in him its last meaning and end, so do all men in all ages and all nations point upward to one universal man, in whom the whole idea of humanity is fully and concretely realized—one, in whom the real and ideal, the natural and supernatural, the human and the divine join in everlasting harmony. And where has such a universal man ever appeared, if not in the person of Him, who once slumbered as a babe in a manger at Bethlehem. He is indeed “the first-born of every creature”—the eternal Word, “*by whom* and *for whom* all things were made that are made.” “But one in a certain place testified saying :—

What is man that thou art mindful of him ?
Or the Son of Man that thou visitest him ?
Thou madest him a little lower than the angels ;
Thou crownedst him with glory and honor,
And didst set him over the works of thy hands ;
Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet.

For in that he put all things in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him : but we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor.”

In Him man has attained to absolute knowledge, for He is the Creator—in Him man has attained to absolute power, for he calmed the boisterous winds, walked on the surges of the sea,

rebuked the violence of disease, and broke the chains of death. All nature, therefore, all science, all art, all history, all philosophy, all religion find their last and true end in Him. He is "the everlasting Yea in whom all contradictions are solved"—and if the mystery of the entire creation be ever laid bare to our eyes, be it boldly spoken and heartily believed, the key to unlock that mystery and shed a flood of celestial light over the face of nature is the man of men—Christ Jesus of Nazareth.

Mercersburg, Pa.

T. C. P.

FAIRBAIRN'S TYPOLOGY.

The Typology of Scripture, or the Doctrine of Types, investigated in its principles, and applied to the explanation of the earlier revelations of God, considered as preparatory exhibitions of the leading truths of the Gospel. By REV. PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, Salton. Two volumes in one. Pp. 325 and 324, 8vo. Philadelphia: Daniels and Smith. 1852.

FAVORABLE notice of this recent work in its European form, has already appeared in different parts of our country. We have it here in a substantial and comparatively cheap American reprint, by which it is made more generally accessible, and is likely to have no small circulation. As will be seen by the number of pages, in all 650 of well filled stout octavo size, it is a production of more than merely popular and general pretension. It aims at something of scientific thoroughness and completeness; for which also the author shows himself to be more than usually well qualified by wide reading and much study, as well as by proper original powers of a truly high and respectable order. At the same time, however, the science of the book is put into a perfectly popular and easily intelligible form. It is written in a clear perspicuous style, which is moreover always remarkably regular and correct. It would be better perhaps, if the regularity were less monotonously even, and if the discussion in some parts were less oppressively full.

The importance of the subject will be readily acknowledged on all hands. It will be generally felt too, that it is a subject which still greatly needs discussion and elucidation; though with some it may have grown into a sort of settled principle indeed, that the need is one for which it is vain to expect any satisfactory help, and that to bestow much care upon it accordingly is but a waste of thought and time. The typology of the bible has been so much abused, has been subjected to such conflicting and contradictory systems, has been the field of so many wild arbitrary and fanciful interpretations, that it is no wonder it has come to be regarded by many as an unprofitable and useless study. From the extreme of finding types everywhere and in every thing, there has been a strong reaction the other way, till in modern times the progress of opinion has come to be powerfully towards the denial of them altogether.

The difficulty is to fix on a scheme, by which the determination of types, and the interpretation of them, may not be left to hazard or caprice, but shall proceed according to some objective

rule or reason in the matter itself which is thus to be explained. Without this, it is plain there can be no certainty, and at best but small force, in any use that may be made of the bible in this way. The old Protestant method, as we have it exemplified in such writers as Glass, Cocceius, Witsius, and Vitringa, was very loose. "Like the fathers, they did not sufficiently distinguish between the allegorical and typical interpretations, but regarded the one as only a particular form of the other, and both as equally warranted by New Testament scripture. Consequently the rules and principles which they adopted were very much the same for both kinds of interpretation.—They held, that there was a twofold sort of types, the one *innate*, consisting of those types which are somewhere in scripture itself declared to have been such, and explained; the other *inferred*, consisting of such as, though not particularized in scripture, were yet on probable grounds inferred by interpreters, as conformable to the analogy of faith, and the practice of the inspired writers in regard to similar examples." The latter class were taken to be equally proper and valid with the other. From their very nature indeed they could only be employed for the support and confirmation of truths already received; but still they were not on that account to be less diligently searched for, or less confidently used, because thus only could Christ be found in all parts of the bible, which yet must be taken to testify of him everywhere.

This system proceeds on the wrong principle, that a resemblance of *any sort* is sufficient to constitute the relation of type and antitype. But, as our author well remarks, to deal with the word of God in this arbitrary manner, "is to caricature rather than to vindicate its great theme, and to throw it open to every frivolous or extravagant conceit." Its palpable errors and imperfections have led to its general rejection; while our later Protestantism, so far as it has claimed to be scientific, has very generally fallen upon the rule, that "just so much of the Old Testament is to be accounted typical, as the New Testament affirms to be so, and no more." So we have it explicitly laid down by Professor Stuart, in his edition of Ernesti. We have always felt this rule to be very unmeaning and false; and we are glad to find it set in its proper light by the present writer. With all its air of science, this theory is not a whit more rational than the other. It leaves the relation out of which types grow wholly unexplained, and turns all as before into a sort of arbitrary outward mechanism. "It is scarcely possible to conceive a mode of interpretation, which should deal more capriciously

with the word of God, and make so anomalous a use of its historical facts. Instead of clothing these with a uniform and consistent language, it singles out only a few examples, and without any reason shown or conceivable for the preference, sets them up by themselves in solitary grandeur, like mystic symbols in a temple, invested with an air of sacredness and importance peculiar only to themselves. The exploded principle, which sought a type in *every* notice of Old Testament history, had at least the merit of uniformity to recommend it, and could not be said to deal partially, however often it might deal unwarrantably with the facts of ancient scripture; but according to the method now under review, for which the authority of inspiration itself is claimed, we perceive nothing but arbitrary distinctions and groundless preferences."

This scheme is essentially rationalistic in its origin and connections. Latterly a much sounder way of thinking has begun to prevail in relation to the whole connection between the Old Testament and the New, which is leading to a much deeper and better apprehension of typology, the result of which will be in due time, it is to be hoped, the extrication of the whole subject from its past and present difficulties, and the placing of it on higher and far more satisfactory ground. We meet with this better view of things in much of the later German theology. Mr. Fairbairn moves in the same general sphere of thought, with some obligations no doubt to German theology, but with sufficient independence at the same time, and an air of originality that may be considered truly and fairly his own. The general view in question rests on the idea of an organic union, holding between the old and new dispensations, and binding them together as a single system. So regarded their relation to each other is not outward merely and mechanical, but inward rather and living. The entire Old Testament becomes in this way a great prophecy or type of him that was to come. "The Messiah himself is the beginning and the end, the heart and centre, of the whole scheme of God for the salvation of man; the glorious object for whose coming every true child of God waited and longed, to whose person, work, and kingdom all the prophets gave witness, and on the ground of whose prevailing mediation, foreseen and calculated on, all forgiveness of sin and gifts of grace had from the first proceeded. In Christ, therefore, and the things of his salvation, every principle and purpose of the divine mind respecting the people of God terminates and is made perfect; these may be said to be its highest, and indeed the *only* good for sinful men, because on them, from first to last, every

thing is made to depend ; and as all that concerns a fallen world dates from the fatal transgression of Adam, so all that concerns a restored world has at once its rise and its consummation in the perfect work of Christ, the second Adam.”—“The church of the Old Testament is constantly represented as in a state of comparative childhood ; supplied with such measures of instruction and such means of discipline as were suited to its imperfect condition ; its law a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ, and its prophetic scriptures ever opening out in gradual and growing developments the testimony of Heaven concerning him. Up till the coming of Christ the church was in a state of minority, passing through successive stages of advancement, and in them all undergoing preparation for the glorious light and liberties which were to distinguish its condition when arrived at the season of manhood.” Thus as the child is the type of man, or as the life of the plant in a lower stage foreshadows its full growth in a higher, the Old Testament revelation necessarily prefigured its own complete sense as finally brought out by the New, not in the way of arbitrary or fanciful resemblance only, but through the exhibition of the very same principles, proclaimed and acted out as it were on a narrower and inferior scale. “The Mosaic ritual, like every other form of religion, had a shell and a kernel,—its shell, the outward rites and observances which it enjoined, its kernel, the spiritual relations which these implied, and the spiritual truths which they embodied and expressed. Substantially, these truths and relations were, and must have been, the same for the Jew, that they are for the Christian ; for the wants and necessities of the worshipper under both dispensations are the same, and so also is the character of the God with whom they have to do. *There*, therefore, in that fundamental, internal harmony and agreement, we are to seek for the resemblance, which constituted the relation between type and antitype. So that the symbolical institutions of Moses shall appear, when properly understood, as manifestations of Christ’s truth in a lower and earlier stage of existence,—the curiously wrought bud, which contained within its sacred folds every essential principle and relation, that was afterwards to expand, in the work and kingdom of Christ, into full blossom and fruitfulness.”

But with this broad view, it may be asked, how are we to guard against error and extravagance ? “By what means shall we determine in any given instance, that what is alleged as a type was really designed for a type ?” Must we not have the voice of revelation to direct our judgment ? Certainly we must ; but this does not imply the necessity of any such mechanical

rule as is contended for by Marsh, Stuart, and the school in general to which they belong. "It is possible surely," according to our author, "that in this, as well as in other things, Scripture may furnish us with certain views or principles, the special and particular application of which is left very much to ourselves."

Why should we require a mechanical rule in the case of types, more than in the case of prophecies, or parables, or indeed of any portion besides of holy writ? There is a possibility of folly and extravagance in any department of interpretation. What wild use in particular has not been made of the Old Testament prophecies? In no case is the proper protection against error here, to be sought in an outward formula that may answer the same purpose in the hands of all persons, the wise and the unwise alike. The bible is for the use of the intelligent and the free. Its proper interpretation depends on the piety, the learning, the good sense and the right taste, of those who are called upon to explain its meaning. So in every other part of the revelation it contains; and why not so also, then, in that part of it which forms the region of types? The best preparation here for the exposition of the sacred text, and the best guaranty that it shall be conducted in a sound and safe way, is found in the right adjustment of the mind or soul itself to the glorious organism of the word of God, considered as a whole. At the same time however, certain great leading principles may be laid down, which shall serve as a directory and help in the work of carrying out such exposition in its necessary details.

Our author undertakes to furnish us, accordingly, with a number of general conclusions and principles of interpretation, which he supposes to grow forth with inward necessity from his universal theory or scheme, and to be sufficient for keeping a rightly ordered mind within proper bounds in the business of exposition. It does not fall within the design of the present notice, to follow him in this part of his subject; much less to go along with him in the subsequent application of his principles to the actual exposition of the typical matter of the Old Testament, which makes up the great body of his work. Our object is simply to call attention to the work, as one whose general spirit and plan we believe to be of a much better character than the style of thinking which has heretofore reigned in this branch of our English theological literature, and the fundamental view of which may be safely recommended, we think, as satisfactory and safe, in harmony at once with the requirements of reason and the inspirations of true faith.

J. W. N.

KOSSUTH IN AMERICA.

(*From Dr. Schaff's Kirchenfreund.*)

SINCE his arrival on the 5th of December, of the year just drawing to its close, the Ex-Governor of Hungary has been, in an eminent sense, the lion of the day, and the subject of an admiration bordering on idolatry, on the part of the people of the U. States. The newspaper, religious as well as political, the street, and the parlor, and even the halls of Congress at Washington, are full of the Magyar hero; and of the Hungarian question, which he embodies. Just as when, 15 months ago, the genial Swedish songstress landed upon our coasts, the New-Yorkers especially appear to have lost their senses, and to have reached the giddy summit of a fanatical ecstasy. But in enthusiasm for *Louis Kossuth*, the Americans exceed themselves, and furnish a still more striking proof, that with all their calculating shrewdness and practical sobriety, which are in other respects peculiar to them, they yield to no single nation, the French themselves not excepted, in excitability and an inborn propensity to fanaticism. The ceremony of the reception, which was prepared for him in New-York, outdid everything, which, in this department, the history of the new world can present; the City Council, the newspaper editors, lawyers, and all imaginable associations emulated each other in doing him honor; the most flattering invitations to visit Albany, Philadelphia, Boston, &c., were extended to him, and the most costly preparations made for his reception; and to crown the whole matter, the Congress of the United States with a large majority (the opponents were almost entirely southern slaveholders) have welcomed him in the name of the whole nation as their guest, and also invited him to visit the Capital. Such an honor indeed has as yet fallen to the lot of no foreigner, except the French General La Fayette, who moreover had won for himself the especial regard of this country in the war of Independence, and to no American, except the great Washington; but Congress could not by any means consistently avoid such a resolution, after it had once taken the first step in the release and the magnificent transportation of the Magyar in an American ship of war.

Not only political, however, but even religious bodies, as the Methodist and New-school Presbyterian clergy of New-York, presented to him their respects, and congratulated him, because whilst in Turkey he did not apostatize to Mohammedanism! (whereupon he very properly, and at the same time very mod-

estly replied: that this was no merit at all, for how could any one be true to his country or to any other cause, if he were untrue to his God.) The well known clergyman, Beecher of Brooklyn, gave him the use of his church for a speech and for subscriptions, and other protestant clergymen have gone so far, forgetting their own dignity and the dignity of the pulpit, as to make Kossuth the theme of their sermons, and identified the European revolution, without any modification, with the cause of freedom, and the progress of the gospel.

It is true a few have also expressed opinions more or less unfavorable, which have with great injustice been cried down as cowardly and anti-republican; for it requires evidently far more courage and firmness to oppose the wild rushing current of public opinion, than to permit one's self to be carried along with it. In this opposition the Catholic papers are the most decided, especially the Freeman's Journal of New-York, the organ of Arch-Bishop Hughes, who called Kossuth a *humbug* before he came, because in his speech at Southampton he attacked the Jesuits by the way, and praised the Anglo-Saxons, who according to Hughes' highly original view cannot properly be said to have existed, since William of Normandy, the Conqueror, whilst the Irish Celts, to whom he himself belongs, are destined to an eternal duration! The grounds of opposition therefore here lie open at hand, and also the inconsistency, which take away in our view the moral worth, which we otherwise might be disposed to attribute to them. For in the same breath Hughes and his Journal praise the Irish Rebels, and they would doubtless elevate the Hungarian hero to the heavens, if he had not happened to be a Protestant, and if instead of the Catholic House of Hapsburg, like another O'Connell, or Smith O'Brien, he had contended against Queen Victoria, and Protestant England. Much more important, however, because free from religious prejudices, appears to us the opposition of such a distinguished paper as the National Intelligencer at Washington, which certainly does not stand up against Kossuth himself, and his revolution, like the London Times, but combats the bold demands, which he makes upon our nation, and his principles of the relation of our nation to others as anti-american and full of danger.

But however weighty these and other warning voices in themselves may be, and in time may become, they vanish in the noise of the immediate present. The great mass of the population of our cities, who exercise an enormous influence upon our politics, and the preponderating majority of our public or-

gans, are as it were bewitched by the refugee, and every word, that flows from his lips, pours fresh oil upon the fire of admiration for him, and the cause he represents. Under these circumstances it is indeed very difficult in a remote country town, where a person reads only a second edition of this unexampled stir, and through the daguerreotype of the newspapers, to maintain one's calm recollection, and not lose his sense of seeing and hearing before the dazzling fire-works of popular demonstrations in favor of liberty, and the deafening noise of unlimited applause. Yet notwithstanding this, we are firmly convinced that a reaction in public opinion must take place, and that the judgment of the press will, perhaps before these lines reach our readers, receive a marked modification, in proportion as persons become conscious of what earnest, incalculable consequences to our own country and the whole European Continent, an unconditional national acquiescence in the colossal demands of Kossuth must sooner or later draw after them.

For the question here is by no means merely in regard to an individual man, or a personal matter. Otherwise that enthusiasm would be a mere deification of man, and could only prove the shame of Americans. Certainly Kossuth himself, what we may also suppose from his moral and political stand-point, is in any case no common individual, but beyond question a world-historical name, and by far the most significant personality, that the European Revolution of 1848 has made the object of general attention. From moderate circumstances, by talent and industry, he soared aloft to the station of lawyer, representative of the people, minister, and at last to that of Governor, and Dictator of a proud and powerful nation. He was the leading spirit of the whole Hungarian Revolution, which could be overthrown only by the arms of the two greatest powers of the European continent, and by internal treachery. He has not only labored for the cause of freedom, but also suffered; even in Turkish exile his mere name was a terror to the Czar, and his Austrian vassal. His banishment of almost two years has not been able to break his powers in the least, rather he went forth out of the same with new courage under the magnanimous protection of the American eagle of liberty, from Gibraltar took an excursion to England, made a triumphal procession through her larger cities, and electrified by his argumentative, and pathetic eloquence the masses of Southampton, London, Manchester, Birmingham, and all that in a language, which he had learned only out of books. The refusal of Louis Napoleon's government, to permit him to pass through France, the unfavorable

reports in regard to his highly arrogant conduct upon the hospitable ship of war, the *Mississippi*, which found their way into American papers from respectable, and as was stated authentic sources, but which it is true, were soon after recalled, but upon how much ground no one as yet knows, the decided opposition of the *London Times* the most influential newspaper in the world, the position of indifference, which the English Government and the higher classes assumed with regard to the Kossuth Enthusiasm, all these gave him among the middle and lower classes only a still higher elevation, and made the former champion of the decidedly aristocratic and the feudalistic Magyardom in hostile opposition to the other nations of Hungary, in an eminent sense the Man of the People and the Apostle of Democracy, which he now at least with his mouth professes, though still in July 1849 he renounced it with contempt.¹ With such a history behind, and the most intense expectations before him, he landed upon the freest soil in the world, presented the boldest demands, and supported them with an eloquence, which like an irresistible mountain-stream necessarily carried the Americans away, who are more susceptible precisely to this art, than to any other. And certainly we have here before us an overwhelming proof of the power of the living word. The enchanting tones of a Jenny Lind can call forth only a passing feeling of harmony, of satisfaction, of happiness; a powerful speech, however, takes possession of the deeper powers of the spirit, of the intelligence, of thought, of the will, and impels to actions. The recent speeches of the Magyar are so much more worthy of wonder, because the English is not his mother tongue, and because, wearied by the voyage at sea, besides this somewhat sickly, as it appears, and overburdened by visits and addresses, he had evidently for the most part almost no time for preparation, and found himself besides upon wholly strange ground and soil. We scarcely know of an American Statesman, who could throw himself with such facility into European, as Kossuth into American affairs, and in a strange dialect give his thoughts and wishes a like dexterous and powerful expression.

¹ At that time he is said to have written to the "*Concordia*" a democratic Journal in Turin as follows: "Do you know what the word "*Democrat*" among us signifies? It signifies among us nothing else but a fool, a villain, a swindler, or a spy?" From this to his Address to the democracy at Marseilles, and his declamations in New-York, there is certainly an immense stride. But circumstances alter cases, and with certain men also principles.

But even if Kossuth's earlier history and personality were much more significant, than they really are, and if his eloquence had still much more fire and power, than it possesses according to its specimens hitherto : yet it is not by these alone, that such effect is to be explained. Send a preacher of temperance, or any other moral reform, yea, of the everlasting Gospel, with the eloquence of a Whitfield, a Luther, a Bernard, a Chrysostom, a Paul, with the fire of a Moses and Elias, to New-York and Philadelphia, and he would be able to enkindle it is true a much deeper, purer and more permanent, but not by far such a general, and noisy enthusiasm among the people, as Louis Kossuth. It is his *subject*, his *theme*, his *object*, namely the idea of political *freedom*, viewed from the stand-point of the natural man, and adjusted to the earthly, selfish wishes and desire of happiness among the masses, the idea of national *self dependence*, and *independence*, of the social *reform* of all Europe, that gives him such significance, and secures the applause of the world. Kossuth stands before us not as a single individual, but as a representative of certain principles of the greatest importance in a social point of view, as the personification not only of the Hungarian, but of the whole *European Revolution*. This it is, however, precisely, which gives these demonstrations in his favor such significance, and in case they do not dissolve themselves again into empty air like a cloud of smoke, they may draw after them the most serious consequences, indeed change our whole policy hitherto, and entangle us in a general European war.

With a freedom, which we must call titanic presumption, if not boundless impudence, Kossuth has dictated to the United States, to whom he owed a debt of gratitude for their unmerited generosity, what they are to do for him and his cause, and with incredible naïveté, he calls these demands "humble requests," an irony of speech before which the self-designation of the pope as the "servant of the servants of God," vanishes into pure nothing. He, who, as Daniel Webster's letter to the American minister at Constantinople incontestibly shows, was evidently set free from exile with the understanding, that he wished to give up all farther insurrectionary efforts against Austria, and to spend here the peaceable life of an American citizen, and who was delivered over by the Porte to our national protection evidently with this understanding, comes to our coasts in unthankful and shameless abuse of American hospitality, as an *agitator*, and demagogue, desires an official reception as Governor of Hungary, a public hostile demonstration against Austria and Russia, a change of our international laws, and as he sees, that

he receives no sympathy in Washington, he takes it upon himself to discuss the true sense of our Constitution, and the policy of the Father of our Republic, and even to appeal to the sovereign people against their legitimate government, and thereby to plant the banner of discord in our own camp!! But he will not succeed. Americans, and their representatives at Washington have by far too much sound practical tact, by far too much self-respect to permit themselves to be carried away blindly by a never so eloquent Magyar, and by the passing enthusiasm of the New-Yorkers, and laws and duties prescribed to them by convivial associations in champagne-intoxication. After a great excitement, there always follows sooner or later a great reaction, after giddy intoxication sober reflection with a feeling of shame, and a resolution for improvement. So it will happen in this case, and we have no doubt, but that Kossuth yet before he leaves the United States, will see himself powerfully disappointed, in the public opinion of this country, which is not to be found upon the surface of the radical city-press, that lives in the element of excitement, but in the true substance of the nation. We do not mean by this that his whole business will dissolve itself into mere humbug. This we ourselves by no means wish for the sake of our government, which now has committed itself at any rate so far, that it has expressed a generous sympathy for Kossuth, and his fellow exiles, and cannot take back the step already made. The United States can never make common cause with the principle of Despotism: she should and she must as the chief supporter of free institutions, sympathize freely with unjustly oppressed nations, with all constitutional struggles for national independence, and legitimate freedom, and afford a hospitable asylum for the persecuted. But this we believe and wish, that the demands of Kossuth will soon be brought within bounds, and that we may come more and more to a proper insight into the difference between constitutional freedom, and its caricature, lawless arbitrariness, which is only the counter-part of the worst despotism.

It is not our object to throw further light upon the extravagance of these demands, which makes them an impossibility, as this article has already grown beyond its originally intended limits. In conclusion, I wish to throw out only a few short hints.

1. Kossuth desires of our Government a declaration of the independence of Hungary, and titles and carries himself always still as the Governor of that country.¹ Such a declaration would

¹ It is an incomprehensible diplomatic misconception of President Fill-

be plainly a political falsehood, for Hungary is just as much subject to Austria in fact, as Canada to England, Cuba to Spain, and States, in their mutual intercourse; have to deal only with actual circumstances, and not with past facts, or with future possibilities.

2. He desires a radical change in our hitherto neutral policy in reference to other nations, and an alliance of our Government with the English to prevent Russia and other despotic powers from interfering with the internal affairs of Hungary or of any other nation struggling for independence. Kossuth calls this the principle of "non-intervention," but it would be in truth the intervention of free nations, to prevent the intervention of despotic nations, so that the realization of such an alliance between the United States and England, can be thought of only in an entirely extraordinary case, where the interests of both sides are at stake, and a mere united protest to the Czar would pass over without effect. For that he is so easy to intimidate, as Kossuth thinks, no one will believe, who is acquainted with Russia, which from without is absolutely invincible, as Napoleon's campaign shows, and whose colossal physical strength can be broken only by the uprising of her own population, aroused to the consciousness of freedom. Such a protest must therefore, to possess any practical significance at all, pass into *armed* invasion. But this would be the surest way, to entangle Europe in a murderous war and nameless misery, and to convert also our own freedom at last into a military despotism. There is, however, no danger, that our government will so soon forget the counsel of the wise Washington, and give up her peaceful policy of neutrality, under which the United States have grown with unexampled rapidity to their present power, in favor of Utopian liberty-projects, which can be reached least of all precisely by improper intermeddling with other peoples' affairs.

3. Kossuth asks very pressing on every occasion for "substantial material" aid for a new revolt of Hungary against the Imperial House of Hapsburg, and already considerable sums have been handed in by his admirers—(in New-York alone over \$30,000). We may here recognize the prompt and cheer-

more, when in his last Message he gives three times in a short paragraph the fugitive Ex-Governor the title of Governor, as if he were still Governor, and this stands in striking contradiction with his unconditional condemnation of the piratical expedition against Cuba and of its leader Lopez, to whom no title at all is given. Much more considerately Congress in its resolutions of welcome left out altogether the title.

ful liberality and zeal of Americans for the spread of free institutions as something praiseworthy, but must at the same time with a somewhat more thorough acquaintance with European affairs, decidedly express our doubts, whether these gifts, even if they were to swell to millions, would accomplish the desired object. It is an entirely abstract, we might say, absolutely unhistorical view, to believe, that Europe could do no better, than hastily to copy after American institutions and affairs. This is just as unwise, as if a person should wish Asia to become European, or call the middle ages to account, because they were not Protestant in the modern sense. Every land, every nation, and every age has its own peculiar problem to solve. And we ourselves have not yet reached the end of our development, and have no reason to boast of perfection.

But even if we should wish that Europe should have free institutions, as we ourselves out of honest conviction do,—for we are a free-born republican, as well as any American,—the question in the first place arises, whether the proposed method of a bloody revolution, and the triumph of European Radicalism, would contribute anything thereto, or not much rather draw after it a new and a much worse radicalism. This is the most important point, and it cannot be sufficiently impressed upon Americans. They are, upon their own principles, entirely conservative, and regard freedom as being ever in connection with order, and obedience to the laws. The European democracy, however, which Kossuth also in principle professes, if even in character he is distinct and appears to advantage, is in general licentious radicalism, and its leaders in France, Germany and Italy are the sworn enemies of the church, of the christian faith, and of all higher moral ground-work. It is but necessary to cast a glance at German political fugitives in New-York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, &c., at their drinking-clubs, at their newspaper-literature, and other productions, among which a translation of the profane theological writings of Tom Paine especially stands forth very prominent, in order to be convinced of this. This entire want of moral and religious substance is the chief ground, why the revolutions of 1848 failed so lamentably. If the choice of Europe were between Russian and Austrian despotism on the one side, and the national and legitimate freedom of England, and of the United States on the other side, we should naturally, without limitation, with head and heart prefer the latter. But if the alternative be between the despotism of order, and the despotism of anarchy, we should choose the first as the less evil. And this indeed alas, appears at present to be

the true position of things on the European continent. The triumph of the revolutionary party there, to judge from the character of their present leaders, if single honorable exceptions are made, among whom we may very cheerfully number Kossuth, would most probably bring Europe not only no freedom, but plunge it into a dreadful civil war, threaten it with the destruction of its civilization, with universal anarchy, and a new barbarism, and hasten directly by this means the final triumph of Russian Panslavism, as the only deliverer of society from entire destruction. This is not only our apprehension, but that also of the best and wisest men, who live on the theatre of the events themselves, and understand their bearings better than the majority of our American politicians and newspaper editors. True civil and religious liberty is the greatest blessing, but religious and moral licentiousness the greatest curse, that can happen to a nation. From such an evil, may God in mercy defend Europe and America!

Mercersburg, Pa.

T. A.

P. S.—This article was written in the middle of December last, when Kossuth was yet in New-York. Since, that time it has become apparent, that the present Congress of the United States has fortunately too much good sense and conservative spirit, to grant any of his requests; but there is still great danger that many of our unprincipled politicians and demagogues, who have adopted his views on international policy, will try their best by flattering the warlike propensities of the worst part of our population, to ride into power, to involve this country in foreign quarrels and to prepare the ruin of the very liberties, which are our boast. Beware of the tempter!

EUREKA.

EUREKA ; or the Universe ; A Prose Poem. By EDGAR A. POE. New-York : Geo. P. Putnam. 1848. Pp. 143.

IT seems a pity that a solution of the enigma of the Universe, propounded in the most oracular style, should have lain for three years in comparative obscurity, and not have been proclaimed abroad everywhere in the ears of the thinking world. The solution of the problem over which the ancient mathematician cried "Eureka," has long since become incorporated into the fabric of human knowledge ; and in a later day the discoveries of Leverrier and Kirkwood soon became common intellectual property. But here is an announced solution of the great problem with which the intellectual Titans of all ages have been wrestling, and yet it seems doomed to a longer or shorter oblivion.

A common failing of a certain order of genius is the want of modesty. Assuming its inspiration, and assuming that to the glances of its intuitive eye is revealed the absolute truth, it affects to despise the crawling logic of mere talent. This is the position the author assumes, as one of "the *only* true thinkers—the generally-educated men of ardent imagination." In his Preface he says : "*What I here propound is true ; therefore it cannot die*" And what, pray, is this authoritative solution ? A tissue of the baldest, stupidest, second-hand pantheism ! This the author himself shall make apparent. Somewhere and somehow there existed in the deep abyss of the Past a single "Primordial Particle," and from this "our individual, unconditional, irrelative and absolute Particle Proper," were "irradiated spherically," with a force varying as the square of the distance, "a certain inexpressibly great, yet limited number of imaginably, yet not infinitely, minute atoms." Thus he tells us "the constitution of the universe has been effected by *forcing* the originally and therefore normally *one* into the abnormal condition of *many*." Having thus succeeded in filling, from this prolific "Primordial Particle," an inconcievably great, yet limited space with matter, he proceeds to develop the universe out of it, with some correctness, according to the nebulous system. Attraction and repulsion, gravity and electricity correspond to the material and spiritual, the body and soul of the universe. Comets are the "*lightning-flashes of the cosmical heavens*." All this, however, applies only to our own universe. There are "clusters of Universes" bearing no relation to our own. "They could not impress our senses or our souls. Among them and us

—considering all for the moment collectively—there are no influences in common. Each exists apart and in independently, *in the bosom of its particular God.*” The “particular God” of our own universe is a great Heart Divine. “And now this Heart Divine,—what is it? *it is our own!*” The necessity for this lies in “the utter impossibility of any one’s soul feeling itself inferior to another!” The *finale* of the universe will be a re-absorption of all separate souls into the general consciousness. And thus is established his primary proposition, that “in the original unity of the First Thing lies the secondary cause of all things, and the germ of their inevitable annihilation.”

And this is a solution of the enigma of the universe! Poor Poe! we fear the “exhilarating creature” which finally solved for him the problem of his own existence, had something to do with this fanfaronade.

But we forget that it is to be judged only as “a work of art.” It is “a Prose Poem.” And art is claimed in certain quarters to have its own laws of truth; nay its own “religion.” We think we have some love of art but verily this book would give us a headache.

We have noticed the book merely as a natural curiosity—a mental phenomenon of rather a rare order, from which we may derive aid in estimating the “*epoch*” of the nineteenth century.”

Chambersburg, Pa.

J. C.

THE HEAVENLY RECOGNITION.

The Heavenly Recognition, or an Earnest and Scriptural Discussion of the Question, Will we know our friends in heaven? By REV. H. HARBAUGH, A. M., author of "*Heaven, or the Sainted Dead.*" Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1851.

THE question, which the above interesting and attractive book proposes to answer, might be safely left with what has been denominated in our days, the christian consciousness. Who, that has placed his affections upon treasures above, whose conversation is in heaven, where he expects fullness of joy for himself, and his friends, when time shall be no more, but would answer it with an emphatic affirmative? There can be no such thing, as the word heaven imports, unless it be the meeting point, the recognition of those who buffeted the ills of life alike, fought the good fight of faith, and expected all along to enjoy together at last the same unfading crown. The inmost soul of the christian revolts at the idea, that in his Father's house above, friend will not hold fellowship with friend in a still more intimate manner, than can ever be the case in this world. If there be any truth in the gospel, any fellowship of the Spirit, any hereafter, or any way to make that hereafter an object of desire, then there can be only one answer to the inquiry, Shall we see and know our friends in heaven? If this were not so, the beauty and symmetry of the economy of grace would be marred, and the christian's heart would not be able any longer to regard it as *altogether* lovely.

But there is no lack of arguments to confirm the dictates of the heart. Reason teaches that if there be a heaven, and that saints live there forever in happiness, that then the remembrance of earthly friendships will not be forgotten. There cannot be such an immortality of existence beyond the grave in the proper sense of the term, unless there be a continuance of personal identity, and this cannot hold without a perpetuation of all the faculties of the soul. If memory should cease to discharge its functions, the nicely balanced machinery of the soul would be destroyed, as upon this the activity of all our mental and moral faculties depend for support. But how would this comport with that expansion of soul, which is implied in all our ideas of heaven? The beatific scenes of heaven cannot be supposed for a moment to be capable of erasing from the tablets of the mind the remembrance of events, that have occurred in this world,

for these, like the scenes of childhood and youth, naturally remain, if anything, more indelibly impressed than others. If heaven be an object of absorbing interest to the soul, then the conflicts that were endured in reaching it, must forever possess a similar and kindred interest. But if memory and reason maintain their places, there must be organs to express and communicate the thoughts which they contain. In this world words and ideas are inseparably connected; speech is only the counter-part of reason and reflection; and the latter cannot exist without the former, or at least some substitute for it. No matter, therefore, what the mode of the soul's existence in heaven may be, whether in a body more or less refined or spiritualized, or as a pure spirit, as is the case during the intermediate-state between death and the resurrection, there must be some channel of communication, by which old friendships shall be revived and perpetuated.

What, however, the holiest aspirations of the christian's heart demand, what reason inculcates is abundantly confirmed by universal belief among men. No people or nation has formed a conception of heaven, and there is not a single one, that has not, without regarding it as a reunion of kindred spirits in a better and purer world. Even our own Red-men believe that there is beyond the setting sun a heaven for them, where they will have better hunting grounds, and where with their ancestors and friends they will again light up their council-fires. In the eastern world, it is still customary for women and slaves to ascend the funeral-pile, and destroy themselves, that they may not be separated from those whom they loved in this life. Among the Greeks and Romans, so far as their thoughts were turned to a hereafter, it was a universal belief, that friends in another world would recognize each other. Thus according to Homer and Virgil, the heroes Ulysses and Æneas, when they passed through the infernal regions, met their friends, and identified eminent historical characters, that had lived in former times. Æneas is represented, as having descended to the shades below, that he might converse with his father Anchises, respecting the future fortunes of his house, and accordingly finds him at last in an enchanting vale, where he obtains from him the desired revelations. Socrates in his last hours was sustained in his purpose of dying for the truth of his doctrines by the reflection, that he was about to pass away to the society of the good and great in heaven. "Is it possible," says he, "for you to look upon this as an unimportant journey? Is it nothing to converse with Orpheus, and Homer and Hesiod? Believe me, I would cheerfully suffer

many a death on the condition of realizing such a privilege. With what pleasure could I leave the world to hold communion with Palamedes, Ajax and others, who, like me, have had an unjust sentence pronounced against me? Then would I explore the wisdom of Ulysses, Sisyphus, and that illustrious chief who led out the vast forces of the Grecian army against the city of Troy. Nor should I be condemned to death for indulging, as I have done here in free inquiry." A passage in Cicero, expressive of the same feelings and views, has been often quoted and as often admired. "To this glorious assembly I am speedily advancing; and I would not be turned back in my journey, even on the assured condition that my youth, like that of Pelias, should be again restored. O glorious day! when I shall retire from this low and sordid scene, to associate with the divine assembly of departed spirits; and not with those only whom I have just now mentioned, but with my dear Cato, that best of sons, and most valuable of men." Such testimonies from the heathen world are further confirmed by the universal testimony of the Jewish and Christian Churches. The early Christians, expected soon to meet their friends in heaven, and this doubtless served to make them ready to suffer martyrdom, that they might join those of their friends, who had gone before them. At the present day, the same thought has entered into all our religious thinking. It is a theme to which the poet, the philosopher, and the divine, recur with equal delight to themselves and their readers, as a point about which there can be no dispute.

Under these circumstances it was not necessary, that the scripture should be specially concerned to instruct men as it regards this point, and to tell them in so many words, that friends will know each other in heaven. This is implied in the doctrine of immortality, which it brings to light, and it is but necessary for men to make a proper use of their reflective faculties, to see the connection between the one and the other. It therefore takes the doctrine in question for granted, and in various places speaks of it as something, that has been admitted all along.

Objections may be urged against the heavenly recognition, as well as against any other truth of revelation, but these must lose more and more their force, in proportion as the mind grasps the universalness of the argument on the other side. The principal one is that which occurs most readily to the minds of all alike. How can such a knowledge comport with the happiness of the saints in heaven, who know that some of their friends are in hell? But we might ask how can the Father and the Son be perfectly happy, when creatures of their own formation continue

to suffer innumerable torments? As we cannot suppose that the Deity can experience a morbid sympathy, for those who have no claims upon it, so it must be with the saints in light, whose wills have been made to conform entirely to the will of their Father in heaven. Even in this world the affections of the pious for their impious friends and relatives, fade away in proportion as it appears, that there is no longer any hope of their reformation, and salvation. When at length to all human calculation, they have sinned away their day of grace, and have deeply degraded themselves, their presence becomes more and more painful and offensive to them. But it is supposing too much when it is taken for granted, that the saints will carry along with them all those natural instincts, that have their significance mainly in their relation to this present world. The family institution as it exists here will be abolished, but only to give place to that higher household of faith, the church of Christ. Reverence for parents, and love for brothers and sisters, will be transferred to Christ and his people, of which in this world they have been significant types, and to which they served as a preparatory discipline. We shall not love our kindred in heaven less, but we shall love Christ and his Church more.

On this account we suppose that the doctrine of the heavenly recognition is mainly of account to the Christian in this world. Here he needs to be assured, especially when death and disease invade his household, and strike down one after another of his friends, that he shall meet them again where sickness and death never come. In seasons of trial, of temptation and of bitter conflict, the heart is animated with new courage and resolution, by the reflection, that at last he and his, whom he loves most, shall inherit together the everlasting reward. As it regards the enjoyment, which immediate friends and relatives will derive from each other's society in heaven, this should be regarded as something subordinate to the higher enjoyments, which will then break in upon their souls. Heaven will not diminish this pleasure, on the contrary increase and purify it, but it will at the same time no doubt introduce the soul into enjoyments of a much higher character, of which in this world, we have but a dim intuition.

Such is the tenor of the book before us. Its object is to prove, that there will be a recognition of friends in heaven. Its value, however, as we think does not consist mainly in its course of argumentation. Long before we have closed the book we feel that the point has been established upon an impregnable basis. A moiety of the arguments advanced would be sufficient to con-

vince most persons, that the author's positions are sound and correct, and yet we feel a pleasure in following him through each argument that is brought forward, because the subject is one of universal interest, and because the author is very happy as it regards language, style and sentiment in treating it. A pious, devout, earnest, and religious spirit pervades every page, and most persons would read it as a work on practical religion, for which we think it is well adapted. We think Mr. Harbaugh's style has improved since his former interesting work, on the Sainted Dead. It is more idiomatic, and conforms better to standard authors. In many places it rises into true elegance and grace of composition.

Mercersburg, Pa.

T. A.

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

MARCH, 1852.

VOL. IV.---NO. II.

PROTESTANTISM AND ROMANISM.

THE quiet of the Protestant Church has suffered no little disturbance of late, by the frequency of the transitions from its ranks, to the Church of Rome. In many instances, these defections have been on the part of men, of weight and decided depth of sanctity, earnestness and theological ability. It has been usual in such cases, to dismiss the whole matter, with but a passing notice of the fact, accompanied with perhaps a sneering expression of pity, in view of such an exhibition of extreme folly, the result either of mental imbecility, or of an hypocrisy more or less well concealed. Such has been the complacency and overweening confidence of many good men in the Protestant Church—such the ease with which they have conducted to its final resolution, much of perplexity and mystery, which engaged the prayers and spiritual travail of the Church of all ages, that should any one still be found, who unfortunately, is unable to sympathize in full measure in their confidence, he is set down as a proper subject for commiseration, or else despised as destitute of all moral principle. All this might do, and pass current

VOL. IV.—NO. II.

were it not that recent facts have spoken too distinctly, to allow any longer, such an imagination. It cannot be denied, but that this movement has included men of the first order of mind and spirit. Men, who in the deepest earnestness of their souls, have struggled after a clearer apprehension of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ, and have been led by this step, as *they* fondly trust at least, to the haven of rest.

Now in all seriousness, this subject calls for earnest investigation—for inquiry animated with altogether a different spirit. It becoms us as Protestants, no longer to dispose of the matter in the usual magisterial way, but to challenge ourselves with the inquiry, Is there not some deeper reason for all this, than we have been accustomed to imagine? May there not be a defect, which has led some good men to grow dissatisfied with our religious position? Have these men acted with sufficient reason, or does the difficulty pertain exclusively to their own spirits. Certainly there is room to seek a satisfactory answer to these interrogatories. And since there must be evilsomewhere, and since truth can in no possibility suffer detriment at the bar of inquiry, there is no just reason why it should not be instituted.

There is one aspect of the subject worthy of special notice presented in the fact, that although Protestantism from the beginning, has arrayed itself, in the use of all its superior resources and appliances, against Romanism, yet has it effected comparatively but little in the way of direct opposition and assault, if indeed, in many points it has not suffered decided detriment. This is altogether unaccountable, if the almost universal sentiment among Protestants, that their system is the last, the absolute truth, while the opposite, viz: Romanism is but one tissue of error and corruption, be grounded in truth. The progress of truth has ever been in the midst of, and in unceasing conflict with error, yet has it ever been able, in the end to assert itself victoriously. And such precisely must ever be the issue. But in this struggle, the invincibility of truth seems to be most grievously tried. For upwards of three centuries of untiring conflict, hand to hand, with decided advantages in its favor, has it been doing a fruitless battle, unless indeed it be to have called forth more actively, the resources of what is esteemed the embodiment of Anti-christ; and to have exhibited its inability to impede and overcome its onward progress. Now this might prove of easy and satisfactory resolution, were this struggle included within narrower limits of time and space. Then would we say, error may for a season make a successful stand against truth, as has frequently been the experience of the Church, yet

must the tide speedily turn, and error quail before its power. In this case, however, no room is left for such a solution of the difficulty. Centuries have been engrossed, and world wide has been the scene, and yet do we this day see Romanism, nerving itself with growing energy, with scarcely a wound or a scar to bespeak the severity of the conflict in which it is engaged, and the prowess of the power with which it is at war. Nay more. Just at this time does the tide of success seem to be in its favor and against Protestantism. As we have already seen, many who have sustained a conspicuous part in the service of this latter, and even some from among its champions, have felt themselves constrained, for reasons at least satisfactory to their own minds, to abandon their places in favor of the former. While on the other hand very few if any changes of equal respectability are taking place in favor of the Protestant cause. Why, it may again be asked, all this? Has truth been shorn of its power against error so effectually as to be unable, in this long period to make any material impression upon its enemy—to leave even a trace of its strength upon its deformed body?

It is not a little strange, moreover, that Protestantism, *absolute* truth, as by many it is taken to be, should be unable to commend itself to spirits of the better order, who have been, and still are laboring in the service of the opposite cause. Humanity has an innate affinity for truth; and herein precisely holds the power of truth over it. Error may lead it captive, and hold it firmly bound in its fetters, yet does it recognize truth, when confronted by it; and while it may perversely refuse to submit to its power, it may not refuse its consent to it as truth. Where however, the spirit of man is keenly alive to its moral relations, and earnestly exercised to know the truth, attended besides with intellectual endowments of the highest order, all which are fully possessed by many who find their home in the Roman communion, as we are bound in all candor, as well in common honesty to admit; where such are brought in contact with truth, in the exhibition of both its written and living power—though for *a while* prejudice and education may prevent its embrace, yet may we confidently expect, that presently it will assert its native power, and rise superior to all hinderances. It is not possibly conceivable, that such a spirit, be the outward circumstance of influence never so powerful, could contentedly live in the midst of unmingled error, with the solemn challenge of truth ever addressed to it, without sooner or later in some measure, yielding its consent. It helps not the Protestant cause to deny the existence of such men in the Roman Church. It but creates

against it a suspicion of prejudice and desperation. Such men ever have, and still do live in full honesty and truthfulness to their own deeply earnest convictions, in the bosom of that same church; and the mystery is that they have so found their spiritual wants satisfied in the very sink of corruption and sin, as to enable them to withstand the very truth, for whose refreshing power they ever pant in their inmost spirits.

To the candid, unprejudiced mind, this difficulty calls for some more satisfactory resolution than is usually given—some explanation that, while it asserts the unquestionable power of truth over the human spirit, will at the same time do justice to the piety and devotion, which beyond all question exist within the pale of the Roman Catholic communion. And certainly, none should be more anxious for this precisely, than every devout Protestant. For nothing more deeply concerns the claims of Protestantism itself, as of divine origin, and an embodiment of eternal truth. Should it appear after all, that Romanism is the direct negation of truth, and Protestantism possesses no power to gainsay its pretensions at the bar of the human spirit, then certainly must this last be involved in like condemnation with the first; thus blasting man's last hope for a spiritual home, a sanctuary of rest in this life, and turning loose the hell hounds of infidelity and despair upon a God-forsaken world. Indeed it is not easy to see how good men can rest at all contented with the unsatisfactory and arbitrary solution which is usually given to this awfully solemn difficulty. It would seem, the credit of Protestantism absolutely demands a much larger concession in favor of Romanism than many are willing to make. It is only by acknowledging the existence of truth deep and eternal, sufficient to satisfy the spiritual longings of its devout children, in this, that we can satisfactorily explain the issues of the long continued conflict, with due credit and honor to that. Concede this on the one hand, and the power of truth against error, which is absolute, no longer calls for a doubt as to its existence on the other. Acknowledge truth on both sides, neither the one nor the other free from a serious admixture of error, and the key to the problem is at hand. Truth arrayed against error, truth must ever in the end be victorious. But if truth be violently arrayed against truth, even though error be commingled with it, as is ever the case in this world; inasmuch as truth is eternal and consequently indestructible, the conflict must be a fruitless one for good. Thus too does the error at hand on either side escape the power of the opposing truth, included as it is in the same wholesale assault with its imperishable attendant.

Thus precisely has Protestantism addressed itself to a barren warfare. It has been unmindful of the truth comprehended in the opposing church; and, what is still worse, has to a large extent refused even to acknowledge its existence. As a consequence therefore, it has manifested no concern to save anything as valuable which might be found to exist within it, but aimed at a promiscuous destruction of all good and bad, holy and unholy together. The issues of such a reckless crusade are abundantly manifest in the results already specified.

In addition, moreover, to this, Protestantism has been at fault in its palpable want of proper concern to free itself from anything of error which might haply be found comprehended in its constitution. Unfortunately, an overweening confidence in its freedom from all material admixture of error, has alike prevented, and even interdicted under penalty of the charge of high treason, all earnest inquiry touching this precise point. And even now, although the voice of recent inquiry and developments has spoken so unmistakably, for all who have ears to hear, yet does the man who has heard that voice, and felt the sad verity of its declarations, run a serious venture of losing caste, and incurring the suspicion of being in league with the enemy, if he dares proclaim his solemn convictions. This is much to be deprecated, involving as it does nothing short of treason to the very cause it would advance. That there is error, deep and serious error involved in the Protestantism of the present, which calls for the immediate attention of its friends, it is sheer recklessness to deny. And without all doubt, herein is another grand reason of its want of greater success against Rome, and the movement which we have seen, to be setting in its favor.

The time has come to lay aside prejudice, and with a calm and religious spirit, to contemplate the matter face to face—for a dispassionate investigation, attended with a humble willingness to know the worst of the case, is the only posture of spirit which can give a hopeful promise of success. Argument and history, must supplant magisterial denunciation; and men be honored instead of despised, who point out the seat and nature of the disease which enervates the cause we all love. True wisdom as well all true devotion to our Adorable Redeemer, and his cause, loudly call for this, that if error be found sapping the energies of that cause, it be openly proclaimed. And that man shows himself wanting in a well directed zeal for the truth, who refuses to examine and see whether these things be so. Truth ever invites investigation; error ever shuns it.

To admit the existence of more or less error in the Protestant

movement, by no means involves a sentence of condemnation upon it, or even a betrayal of the want of confidence in its divine mission, and its ability ultimately to fulfil that mission. The Holy Catholic Church, the very infallible body of our Lord Jesus Christ in its ideal character, is nevertheless, in its present actual state, far from exemption from all sin. Its mission indeed involves this. It comes not to catch men as individuals out of the world, and by one exertion of divine power, in a moment to transform them into beings of perfect holiness. It enters rather, *into* the world with all its depravity and corruption, and seeks to grapple with humanity in the midst of these, and by incorporating it, into its own holy body by a process of renovation, in the end to redeem it from the power of sin and Satan. During this process, of course sin is present at every onward step; and it will ever be so until at last the victory will be complete on the resurrection morning. So precisely is it involved in the Protestant movement; as one grand advance in the victorious march of the Church in its militant career. If however the Church would be true to her mission, it becomes it at all times, not to close its eyes upon, and foolishly deny the existence of error, but rather to seek to know it, as an impediment in the way of its progress. Thus will it be enabled the more effectually to exert its irresistible energies to overpower it, and remove it out of the way.

In like manner, on the other hand again, to admit the existence of truth in the Roman Church, and esteem it as a branch of the Holy Catholic Church, by no means involves necessarily a surrendry of true Protestant ground, or a subscription to its errors and defects. Errors and defects it has, and it concerns us as Protestants to seek to overcome them. But this can never be effected, as the history of the last three centuries abundantly proves, so long as the effort be to include in the purposed destruction aught of truth. The history of the past is a standing, living argument in favor of the position, that the Church of Rome does embody fundamental truth. It certainly has shown its adaptation in some measure at least, to the wants of humanity, and exhibited its ability to conduct it in the process of its development. This, error can never do. To it we are indebted for our modern civilization; for whatever influence besides, may have contributed to this end, all must have ever remained impotent, without their mainspring, christianity. This found its exclusive abode in the body of this church. The whole gist of the argument consists simply in this—that any institution which possesses the ability to minister *directly* and permanently to the

true development of humanity, must of necessity contain more or less of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ ; for in him alone can be found the power, the life, by which only it can be saved from the ever disturbing and destroying progress of sin and death, and conducted in the way of its original destiny. Error may contribute *indirectly* to this end, but never directly. Its tendency continually is to lead astray, not to advance. That this Church has ministered in this direction most materially, is beyond all question. No institution could ever for instance, so effectually have overcome the repeated irruptions of barbaric life, so as to have preserved its peculiar character for good—not to reckon in the account the fact of its being transformed into its own character,—without having at hand some power able to grasp and hold in subjection humanity itself. This, without further reference, the Church before the Reformation did do ; and it were to deny all history to controvert the fact. We conclude most naturally then, that this Church does embody a life, which has power to turn our nature from the downward road of sin and conduct it in the way of recovery and life.

Besides, all sound christian feeling must lead to the same conclusion. It certainly will not be denied any longer, at least not by any one who has bestowed upon the subject that charitable consideration of which it is truly worthy—that there has been and still is genuine piety included in this communion. However it may be attempted to account for it, the existence of the fact is no longer an open question. If then there be genuine piety, there must be salvation, and never can salvation be predicated in the absence of the life of Christ. This, therefore must needs be at hand. It helps not the case to say, that these instances are few, and altogether accidental, until it can be made appear that the branch *can* bear fruit dissevered from the vine. The modern theory of the Church will readily deny all this. But so long as it is true that christianity *is a life*, in its literal acceptance, and that all life, to become real and available to the world, must assume some outward tangible expression—and that we have no right to expect to find this life only as comprehended in its proper outward revelation, this denial can effect but little for the issues of truth. Moreover, we find here firmly held and earnestly taught all the leading doctrines of our holy religion, as set forth in the Apostle's Creed, and although these may be attended with grievous error, yet does not that argue any more the want of a churchly character, than the existence of sore error does against the like claim on the part of Protestantism.

As Protestants then, we are bound to discriminate between

truth and error. It concerns us first, if we would gainsay effectually the pretensions of Rome, to know as nearly as possible, what of truth is comprehended in it, and with most studious care seek to deliver it from the fetters of sin with which it may be found to be trammelled. We should learn to respect truth wherever found; and feel that it involves no apostacy from Protestantism, to admire and love and proclaim it, when found animating even the much hated Church of Rome.

The first demand, however, which is made upon the attention of the Protestant Church, just at this time, is to be jealous of its own purity; to give heed to know and remove all error from its own constitution. Let it first cast out the beam out of its own eye, that it may see clearly to cast out the mote out of its brothers eye. Only as this is done, may we look for happy results from the conflict.

To do all this; to discover what is good and what is bad in Romanism, as also, what is truth and what error in Protestantism, we must inquire into the historical significancy of each, and the relation of the one to the other. Thus may the way be opened for a just discrimination between falsehood and truth on either side—for a mutual condemnation of the first, and confession of the last.

All history, how diversified and contradictory so ever it may seem in its detail, is but the embodiment of one great process—the gradual unfolding of one grand scheme, conceived and being executed by an All-wise Jehovah. This plan involves in the end, the last design of creation, in the entire range of its economy—comprehending all things in one.

In the early ages of our race, and on through the Old Testament dispensation, we discover the whole order of things to be disciplinary for that which lay beyond in the future, and in which at last, all that preceeded, back even to the beginning, should find its significance and design. In the fulness of time—when types and shadows had accomplished their mission, we find the revelation of the substance in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ; gathering up all things—“the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last,” in one glorious living reality, which from that period, on to the final consummation of all things, finds its ever increasing revelation for the world, in his true body, the Holy Catholic Church.

Slavery and death, the first ever involved in the last, was man's dreadful inheritance. “To preach deliverance to the captives, to set at liberty them that are bruised,” did Christ come. But freedom from sin and death, presupposes necessarily life, for

aside from life, freedom can never be predicated. Christ came, therefore, into the world primarily, to give it life, and by giving life, to bestow at the same time, all that is involved in its true idea; one element of which we have seen to be freedom. "The truth shall make you free." "If the Son (who is the truth) therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed;" free, in the absolute sense of the term.

But all life involves a process, growth, development. Christ came not to annihilate the dominion of sin by a single stroke of omnipotence, else must the history of the Church, and indeed our own consciousness, prove a sad commentary upon the efficiency with which he accomplished his work. He came rather to cast the small mustard-grain into the world—to deposite in humanity the leaven of his life, which in due course of growth and inherent power of development, should on the one hand become a great tree; and on the other, transfuse the entire constitution with its vivifying power. This tree is the Church, this vivifying power, his life; which is destined to sanctify our nature in the entire round of its existence, both moral, intellectual and physical. Not indeed that this life is susceptible of any growth in itself considered; but only in the process of its enlargement in the world, and its sanctification of our nature in every department. We are led to expect therefore, that the history of the Church will present us an account of this growth, and mark out its onward progress in the midst of conflict and contradiction on every hand.

If then we would learn the significance of any movement included in this process, or the relation of one step to another, we must consult the record of the consciousness of the Church of the past, with due reference at the same time to that of the Church of the present, and in its light. Thus to explore the course marked out by the ultimately truthful movement of the Holy Church of our Blessed Redeemer, attended with the candle of inspiration to direct our steps, we may cherish the hope of a rich reward for our labor.

As being precisely in point, in such an investigation, we may with the greatest profit, keep continually before our mind the deeply significant words of the Apostle Peter. "And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly-kindness; and to brotherly-kindness, charity" (2 Peter 1: 5-7). In these words we discover marked out, the true and only order of the development of humanity; considered either as

general or individual. No other order, can in any possibility, be substituted ; it is involved constitutionally in our nature, and so long as it can make *any* progress towards its perfection, its footsteps must fall in this precise track. Never did a more profoundly philosophical formula find utterance from human lips, than we here find expressed in the language of the unlettered fisherman. By no possibility may we disarrange this order, without contradicting the very idea of legitimate growth in our human life. Temperance, can never take the precedence, in order of evolution, of knowledge ; nor can patience ever lead the way to temperance, in the sense in which the terms are here used. Christianity is but humanity in its perfect form. Inasmuch then as this is in the world at first as the mustard-seed and the leaven, we may look for it to take its onward course of extensive conquest, and intensive sanctification, in obedience to the laws of that nature. To be certified that such has been and still is the order of its history, both in the individual christian, and in its general life as comprehended in the Church, we need, on the one hand, but to consult individual christian experience, and on the other to trace the history of the Church as it has come down to us from the person of Christ.

This order begins of course with the presupposition of life, as it stands opposed to spiritual death. To have faith, is at the same time to have life ; they can never be separated ; both are involved in justification. When therefore, to consider the subject in its individual relation, the sinner is regenerated, when the leaven of Christ's life is infused by the Holy Ghost into his nature, he is invested with a principle, which in obedience to the law of his life will here begin its historic progress, and will continue until he is wholly redeemed from the power of death. The first fruit of this process, is the outward renunciation of the world—the abandonment of the walks of vice, in favor of righteousness. To suppose otherwise, were to fancy that one might, for a season at least, be it never so brief, be dead unto sin, and yet live in its service. Hence the rule of scripture, "by their fruit ye shall know them." The man therefore who reveals not the presence of the new creation within him, by its proper effects upon his life, lacks the first testimonial to justify a hope of its existence. The exchange of a life of wickedness for a life of virtue has ever been esteemed indispensable, to entitle the profession of any one to respect. This exchange is possible however, only as the spirit is enabled, by the quickening energy of the Holy Ghost, to assert itself over against the powers of darkness, which press in opposition to it from within as also from without.

In proportion exactly as this attitude is assumed, does the spirit find itself oppressed by the fierceness of the assault, whose aim is to intimidate and overpower. The very mission of our holy religion involves conflict; and he that would espouse its cause must expect to realize in his experience many a struggle, fierce and lasting. He is called upon to do battle against a power, armed with the weapons, as well of persecution as enticement; to terrify with its frown, or seduce with its smile, the soul enervated by the bondage of indwelling sin.

Of all this does the regenerate soul become speedily conscious. Danger within answering to ruin without, must jeopardize its constancy, only as faith in Christ gives birth to a heroic fortitude, whose energies are drawn out, as trial is at hand. Thus indeed is the christian brought to a proper self-consciousness in the midst of a world of corruption and sin. Only as he is brought thus to assert himself in opposition to his own corrupt nature, and the power of spiritual death, does he truly find himself again, alive in Christ. This courage, this fortitude, this bold undaunted christian bravery—this conscious affirmation of the power of a new life within him, is it, that the Apostle would have added to faith, as its first and necessary production.

The attainment of virtue, as now exhibited, must be taken as but a preparatory step to a conscious entrance upon the history of the christian life. Reason and will entering into the whole routine of his development, intelligence must needs be called into active exercise, by which the individual is enabled to discover his proper existence. Then is he prepared to employ the necessary instrumentalities, to draw out the deep and ever expanding contents of his life. Until then, the child of God is brought to *feel* himself to be a new creature, and apprehend himself, in the midst of a new heavens and a new earth, he remains but a *babe* in Christ, without any clear spiritual perception of his real existence. But when by the power of the new life, unto which he is begotten, he is enabled at last to grow into consciousness, he is prepared for himself, to employ those necessary conditions, which are treasured up in the body of the Church for his use, by which this life is to be nourished, and caused to unfold its activities, which before had lain dormant in his person.

Having made this attainment, the christian is prepared to advance. Not at random, but in a course which is comprehended in the developing power itself. So soon then as he has defined himself, over against all opposition from without, he is most naturally led to turn within and contemplate his own spiritual exist-

ence, his relations and necessities. Hence he discovers a new field of vast expanse, opening up to his view an order of existence to which he had before been lost in well nigh total ignorance. And now for the first time, is he able to apprehend the truth clearly—now only that he has eyes to see, and a spirit to comprehend; for it is only as the power of a spiritual discernment is possessed, that spiritual realities can be apprehended. To know and to understand, is consequently the task before him. Accordingly he betakes himself, with the light of revelation, under the conduct of the Church, to explore the goodly land, to learn its beauties and enjoy its treasures. In a word, man emerging from the darkness of sin, finds himself ignorant alike of his own proper being, his God, and his relations to him; and *in advance* of all else of spiritual culture, he is called upon to surmount the evil in the way of spiritual education. Without this, the possibility of progress is most effectually precluded.

It must not be supposed, that the stadium of knowledge stands disconnected, and in no necessary order of sequence to virtue, which precedes it. It is but its legitimate advance and fuller expression. In the sphere of virtue, we reach the point of the consciousness of a divine life, in its general sense—our eyes are opened intelligently to our true existence as comprehended in it: while in the sphere of knowledge, this general consciousness passes over to the apprehension of the several contents, and their relations, of the spiritual existence, as comprehended in the general life. To grow in knowledge, is but to enter more fully into the idea of this divine life, and appropriate to ourselves progressively, the glorious realities which enter into it as elements. Hence does the Apostle say, with a most profound insight into the nature of spiritual things, “add to your virtue, knowledge.”

In proportion as progress is made in knowledge, we look naturally for its corresponding outward expression in the life. This *must* follow. By this attainment, the believer is made to feel most sensibly, his condition as under the power of sin, and his relation and duty to God. The very first truth which fastens itself upon his spirit is, “Ye are bought with a price,” which, answered back again from the depths of his consciousness, “I am not my own, but belong unto my faithful Saviour Jesus Christ,” reveals at once to him, the relation of self to God. Self must be brought into profound submission to God—self must be denied. By nature, this is deified, and crowned with honor, as being the supreme principle in life. It claims to be the embodiment of all authority, and would have the whole world center in it. Its will is its law; and its pleasure, the rule of action

for all besides. It knows no objective authority, it acknowledges no rule beyond the narrow confines of its own individuality. The first practical effect of the truth as just described, *must* be, the entire renunciation of self, as the active principle of *sin*—to feel, and of course to act accordingly, that there is an objective authority—a will to which the individual must hold himself profoundly submissive; which will he discerns in the volume of inspiration. The christian must thus learn to deny himself; and submit most freely to all the will of God—to obey when he commands, to refrain when he forbids. Thus will he add to his knowledge, its natural product, temperance.

This too, is but as it should be; to the end that man may be released from the bondage of spiritual death, and raised to the enjoyment of the liberty wherewith Christ came to set us free. There can be no freedom, in its true sense, without submission to authority. It always presupposes conformity to the law of being. Man *cannot* be free, unless he bows with the profoundest submission to the law of his own existence, lodged deep in his moral constitution—which law is the law of God, and his will concerning him. Nor is this all. Freedom finds not its true idea in *mere* submission to authority. The unwilling slave may yield to the authority, he cannot or dare not resist; yet is he far from being free. It is only as the objective law finds a subjective existence in the individual—only as the will of God is answered by a full, clear and voluntary response, in the will of man, that he is entitled to be called free. Patience must be added to temperance, before he can be said to realize the freedom wherewith only the Son of God has power to set us free.

By patience, the Apostle doubtless means this free consent to all of restraint imposed by the divine life, which embodies God's law upon our sinful nature, as it stands opposed to a slavish obeisance or a stoical indifference. This free consent can grow out only from a conscious perception of its holiness and truth, which we have seen to be involved in the christian history as above traced. In this stadium of temperance, we find the believer reaching the conscious apprehension of objective authority; in that of patience, we see this meeting its complement in a voluntary subjective consent. Thus do we see reason and will alike transfused with the power of the divine life, and man in the profoundest depths of his personality, redeemed to life and liberty in Christ Jesus.

Thus is the individual brought at length to a full consciousness of his vital union with Christ, and is restored again to the image of God. Godliness, or God likeness, is the form of his

being as thus redeemed. Having surmounted in this way the bondage of spiritual death, and attained the clear perception of his relation to the "true vine," he is enabled to perceive also his fraternal relation to all the other branches, and has the power, as never before, to say, from the profoundest centre of his sanctified person, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of Saints."

As such is the order of development of christianity as a new life, as it individualizes itself in the single christian, so too must we expect to find it under the form of a general objective force, as it enters into conscious union with the life of the world. Nor indeed can it possibly be otherwise. The particular can never overstep the general in any respect; for in this alone has it any true import, and must conform to its laws. Nor is it possible for it to outstrip the general in the progress of its evolution. Individual piety is consequently conditioned—takes its complexion, and receives its proportions, from the church of the age in the midst of which it stands; just precisely as the same holds true, in the case of our natural human life. We are authorized, therefore, to expect of all true history the exhibition of this precise order of growth, in the church, from its Pentecostal birth, through its varied fortunes and vicissitudes, on to the period which at any time it may be found to have attained. Nor indeed are we in danger of finding facts in any other relation, than friendly to the spirit of inspiration, as we have its utterance in the language of the Apostle Peter.

Cotemporary with the birth of the Church we find its enemies, in every direction, in array against it. The world beheld in it an order of things, not only new, but for the most part at variance with all that it had been accustomed to esteem holy and of good report. Consequently it was not slow to array itself against it, in the use of all those hellish appliances, which the enemy of all that is good, furnished ready for its service. Persecution, his most terrific engine, was freely employed to intimidate its children, and crush its rising existence. It would seem as though the powers of darkness understood full well its world engrossing import, and would by any means, like their faithful servant Herod, at a previous period, destroy it in its infancy. The more immediate cause of this rage on the part of the world, and the civil power as the executor of its wrath, was doubtless the fact that christianity at once separated itself from it, and by the lives of its true subjects, and the most direct declarations, denounced against it its sentence of condemnation; and the fact also that the introduction of such a vitalizing principle, could but cause

agitation and ferment in the midst of the old life into which it was infused. This was regarded as a direct assault upon all that was held sacred ; and as a consequence, in obedience to the dictates of the cruel spirit of the dominant religions, it sought the extermination of this bold innovation, as the embodiment of atheism itself. But violence was not left to do the work of destruction, without the co-operation of the culture of the age. Written attacks were made to inspire a general prejudice against it, and by ridicule and falsehood, to expose it to contempt. Celsus, early assailed it with the pen of derision, while his friend Lucian joins in his mirthfulness over the ignorant fanaticism and inconsistency of the deluded followers of an executed convict.

Against all this did the Church, in the spirit of divine fortitude, make an uncompromising stand. These assaults, whether of outward force or of intellectual demonstration, had but the effect to define the more distinctly the deep line of demarcation between itself and the world, and wake it up to a lively consciousness of its own true character in the midst of opposition and hostility. This was necessary ; for only as the Church was enabled to find its proper self, and assert its existence consciously, was it brought to understand its mission,—which was, in turn to grapple with the hostile world around it, cast it down, only however to raise it up again to newness of life. It came into existence like the infant, with the power of life at hand, but required growth, and opposition from the world without to reach a recognition of itself, and thus be prepared to enter intelligently upon its mission. This attainment is what we have already seen to be involved in the christian idea of virtue.

The Church at length, in the good Providence of God, found a respite from her troubles and sufferings. In the face of all opposition, most wonderfully did it assert its own truthful constitution, and extend abroad its borders. Now that quiet was restored, it was led to turn within itself, and inquire into its inward life and relations. Having apprehended its separate existence, it would learn of this existence and its proper contents. As a means to this end, it found itself in possession of revelation ; but this portraiture of the divine life in its several features and proportions, could be appreciated, only as it was step by step aroused to a consciousness of them, as they were found in living reality in its own constitution. No delineation or picture of life can ever be intelligible but to the life itself ; and that too, in proportion exactly as that life comes to know itself in its several elements and various phases. So with the Church. From the centre of a general consciousness, it must enter into an examina

tion of itself, and learn to know not only itself, but also what this self contained. Hence to study the scriptures and its doctrines, was at the same time but to inquire into the contents and life of the Church. The doctrines of the Bible have no significance or power for the Church, only as they find their substance in its own divine constitution as the living body of Christ.

This growing consciousness required again contrast. It must assert itself over against everything besides, and in all directions. To this end we already see this process of discrimination at work, embracing all that was good, and denouncing all that was bad, as contrary to the life of the Church. This last is *heresy*; which must needs arise out of an attempt to cast the truth after the shapeless mould of sinful humanity, and thus turn it into a lie. Two main heretical tendencies, we find during this period; the Judaizing and the Gnostic. The first grew out of the effort to apprehend the relation between Christianity and Judaism. It endeavored to hold fast to the latter, while it would incorporate the former, as its own completion, and after its own cast give it complexion and shape. This tendency made account only of the temporal phenomena, and clung to the letter, to the neglect of the vivifying spirit. It saw in Christ the long promised King of Israel, a temporal Prince, the Son of man, making all account of his human side, to the disparagement of his divine. The second sprang from the philosophic soil of the Grecian mind. This approached Christianity upon the opposite side from Judaism. It affected to soar aloft, far above the world, and the bondage of the flesh, and live entirely in the spirit. It therefore made Christianity all spirit and no body. It saw in Christ his divinity, but failed to apprehend his humanity. Out of these two tendencies, (not to trace them in their subsequent phases and commixtures) arose the great issues concerning the person of Christ, which for so long a period disturbed the rest of the Church. Thus much, in a brief way, for what is usually denominated the *doctrinal period*; in which we find the Church seeking to know the contents of its divine constitution, and to reduce them to a logical form of faith. Thus did it add to virtue, knowledge.

It must not be supposed however, that this process of self-evolution, was completed with what is usually regarded as the close of this period. Far otherwise. It never yet has ceased, nor will it until the Church reaches its ideal—the perfection of beauty. Each successive step in its history takes up all that preceded it, and carries the whole on to a higher stage of development.

The Church having now made some progress in the apprehension of her own life and character, it must needs give heed to the practical workings of this life. Having learned, as we have seen in the case of the individual, its relation to Christ as its great head, it must now reiterate, to the world, to enlighten and save, the faithful transcript of its own consciousness, "Ye are not your own;" and to teach it wholesome lessons of restraint and obedience. It became the great pedagogic institute to the world, to inspire it with a sense of reverence and submission of self to a power above it. This principle of authority we find embodied in the Church of the Middle Ages. To teach this lesson was the mission of Romanism.

It is not necessary at this time to appeal to facts in confirmation of this position. Nor indeed can any be adduced with equal purpose, to the entire history of that period. It requires no extensive acquaintance with it to satisfy the candid mind, that such precisely is the case. Christendom everywhere was made to feel, that a power was lodged in the Church to which it was bound to submit. No pretension was allowed to array itself in opposition, without being made to feel the weight of its power. That this lesson was most effectually taught, is exhibited in the facility with which the most diverse and barbarous races were brought into the profoundest submission to its authority, and held there in peaceable subjection. The Church, feeling that this lesson was for man in the entire range of his being, hesitated not to overstep the bounds of her *spiritual* guardianship, and to declare to him, that in his political and social as well as intellectual relations, he was no less the subject of its domination. And accordingly feeling the kingly character of the life it embodied, the right of universal dominion both in Church and State, was at length asserted by the intrepid Gregory VII, and realized in some measure, for a brief space, under the administration of Innocent III. Even to this day is this the great principle of that communion, against which so many protests are filed, as something intrinsically bad.

This course of training, we say, was absolutely necessary. Man by nature is devoid of this principle. Sin knows no authority but self; and it is essentially necessary that man be instructed in the truth in this particular; for this principle is indispensable to the idea of human freedom, as is also its co-ordinate element, voluntary consent.

The fact the Church should have been carried into the extreme of the principle of authority, and that at last it put on the form of real spiritual tyranny, is not to be wondered at; much

less does it justify a denial of the divinity of its mission. The Church in its militant state is fallible ; but that does not ignore its divine character. We see similar extreme movements in the case of doctrine, yet all must feel that this argued not the least against the presence of the truth. The tremendous conflicts through which the Church was called to pass, the stubbornness of the material to be wrought upon, the desperate resistance made against it by a wicked and perverse humanity, make it truly wonderful that the Church was competent for the task, and presents an all-sufficient apology for the errors into which it fell. And to say now that all this was the workings of the Devil, and the embodiment that wrought it was none other than Antichrist, is verily to attribute to him a work which he would be the last to accomplish. It is to have a house divided against itself. The Devil, with his most powerful agencies, to array himself against his own cause, and conduct humanity half-way towards its emancipation from his power ! Truly would it be well for many now in the world should he betake himself again to a similar work. No. It was the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ that wrought all this ; that same Church which having accomplished the complementary step to this movement, in the process of its history, will present man free in the fullest sense, from the dominion of death. The Catholic Church of the middle period wrought this work, and although it did err, and sin, and apprehend the truth in an extreme way ; yet, nevertheless does it stand to its credit precisely to have added temperance to knowledge.

In due course of time we find this Middle Period to have opened the way for that which was to follow in legitimate order. Not as something foreign to it, or in reality hostile ; but as its necessary product and outbirth. And such indeed it must have been, if it would make good its title to respect. To assert that it came from abroad, even as a direct revelation from heaven, is to deny that it was involved in Christianity from the beginning. To attempt however to invest it with this character, in the absence of all miraculous authentication, is to strip it of its last claim to our respect. The Church must at any period, comprehend the whole idea of christianity, either consciously or unconsciously, as the embodiment of the indivisible life of Christ. It must therefore include at any time, potentially, all that ever can be subsequently evolved, in the way of true history. Hence must that which followed the Church of the Middle Period, and all which may yet follow on to the end of time, as the product of christianity, have been included in its life. This, as just

intimated, may have been unconsciously to the Church ; but this argues not a whit against its parentage or the legitimacy of its birth.

The mission of the Church of this period, which as before said is the Roman Catholic, was to assert the claims of christianity as a general objective life. The individual must feel that he stands in a life vastly more general and extensive than himself, in which only he can live, and from which he derives his significance. Sunder him from the general, and he becomes an anomaly, a monstrosity. This mission in the midst of huge difficulties, it was successful in fulfilling ; not however without a onesided and extreme tendency. Against this violent ejection of its life from its central channel, it must needs protest, and a reaction take place. This life embodied the principle of law, but not in the form of tyranny. The general must assert its claims, but not at the expense of the individual. This last, too has its rights, and to be in lawful relation to the first, it must be not in the attitude of a forced, but a voluntary consent to its claims. All oppression must in the end beget revolution. And such, without qualification, was the nature of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. It was the protest of the divine life itself, against the abuse to which it had been subjected ; and the assertion of the rights of the individual over against the tyranny of the embodiment of the general.

Thus we find the Church conducted on to its third period, (more properly perhaps, the last stage of the second) the stadium of patience, asserting the co-ordinate element of the true idea of freedom. This period sustains a different relation to the one going before, from what that did to its predecessor. The doctrinal period engaged the activity of the Church in the way of conscious reflection upon its contents, and the reduction of these to a logical form. The one following, found it embodying these same in the form of active life. But this, as we have already seen was but partial, one-sided. The two great co-ordinate elements of human life, reason and will, it would seem require to be evolved, not simultaneously, but separately and in order of sequence, reason of course taking the precedence. This consequently found its expression first. But in this separate form it could but be one-sided and extreme. Hence did a maimed consciousness call accordingly, for the revelation of its complementary side in the same form of active life in the Church. And this precisely is it, which is to employ mainly its activity in this last period. It is not so much to supersede as to complete—not to destroy, but to inspire with healthful life. The mission of

Protestantism, which is no other than the development of the principle of patience, is not to uproot and destroy the Roman Church, but to complete it, by supplying what it lacks. The idea embodied in each is indispensable to the idea of christianity itself. Destroy either, were it possible, and you well nigh destroy the other; or at least doom the Church to repeat the spiritual labors of by-gone centuries. Neither one separately taken gives full expression to christianity, but the two together, conducted onward to a harmonious union in the form of godliness, the next step in the process of development marked out by the Apostle.

As already declared, the authority of the general objective church-life, had been carried out in an extreme way, to the injury of the individual subjectivity, in the Church of Rome. Against this we find the divine life entering its protest, in assertion of the rights of the latter. It was felt that the Church was the living body of Christ, and as such, had alone the power to impart life to the individual. To it, therefore did this last stand subject. To it pertained the authority to declare what was truth, and what consequent duty, as comprehended in its own constitution, and set forth in the word of God, as its inspired revelation. But it was likewise felt at the same time, that this did not require the negation of the activities of the individual, but their most intense voluntary exercise. He must submit to its instructions and yield it obedience not as a matter of coercion, but of consent, induced by a perception of its truthfulness.

But unfortunately, as is ever the case in the history of humanity, laboring under the disorganizing effects of sin, the reaction from one extreme, tended irresistibly to the other. This however was necessary, that the mission of truth with reference to the human world might be accomplished. Its several elements must assert themselves first in a separate way, involving more or less of opposition, until at last having inspired humanity with their mutually attractive energies, the way is opened up for a coalescence in the form of life. It was necessary therefore that the principle of authority should first assert itself under a separate form, and that subsequently its opposite, yet co-ordinate side, should come to a like separate declaration. In the history of each, we must look for distortion and extreme. They must grapple with the world, and pursue it with their subduing power to the opposite extremes of lawlessness and slavery, and bring it back from its wanderings to inward harmony and reconciliation. These elements, working this process of renovation, must of course for the time being, partake more or less of the complex-

ion of the corrupt life, into union with which they are brought ; and only by slow degrees to overcome its hostility—cleanse it from sin, and at the same time leaven it with their own vitality.

The history of Protestantism, from its beginning to the present time, has manifestly labored under this one-sided tendency. It had no mind at first to repudiate its allegiance to the Church, by denying its authority ; but sought rather to assert the right of the individual in full consonance with his true relations to it. This however was impossible. And the very first indication of this impossibility was the exercise of the arbitrary power of the Church itself. The new movement was compelled to assert itself in a separate way. And as extreme ever begets extreme, so has Protestantism continued in an increasingly divergent course. As the principle of authority ran over into tyranny, so the individual will has run out into wilfulness. One is taken as the negation of the other. The claims of the objective, it is imagined, require the denial of individual rights, while on the other hand, the rights of the individual require a like denial of all objective authority. This last has unfortunately come to be to a large extent the standard of truth in the Protestant Church. Here the authority of the Church has come to be the next thing to nothing ; its existence as an objective reality for faith—a Romish superstition ; its body as the repository of life and salvation—a nonsensical fancy ; its consciousness, as the living perception of the truth—a denial of the authority of God's word ; its claim to be the divinely commissioned interpreter of scripture—a soul endangering error of Rome ; as to the sacraments possessing the power of an objective grace, to be apprehended, not created, by faith—this is downright heresy ; and inasmuch as all these dreadful superstitions, might be found involved in the admission that christianity is *a life*, it is extremely dangerous, to say the best of it, to promulge such a doctrine.

Thus most effectually is the idea of the Church as an objective life-bearing institution repudiated. As a consequence of this again, man has to do with God immediately and for himself. He approaches him in the exercises of prayer and the study of the Bible. His blessings are transmitted, fresh and first handed, direct from heaven by the express agency of the Holy Spirit, who he believes dwells in him in some strange way. His knowledge of christian doctrine—which by the way, is altogether a matter of secondary importance, it is well to have some share of it, but he can reach heaven with that share being very small—for this he asks no favors of the Church—he has his Bible and from it he can learn the mind of God for himself ;

and he is just as able to discern that, in its lucid teachings, as the whole Church put together. If the Church differs from him, as to the meaning of scripture in any particular, he of course is right, and it is wrong. Should he find however that his own Church differs with him, and condemns his judgment; this still affects not the truth which for himself he drew from the great *source* of all truth, the Bible. He still is right, and his Church is wrong; and hence he must go out from its midst and establish the *true* Church, based upon nothing but the Bible. He will preach the *pure* gospel; and all the world besides, failing to believe as he does, is in great danger of being lost. The sacraments of course he will observe, because Christ commanded it, but had he not done so in so many words, there would have been no duty in the case; and he cannot see that christians would have suffered any special detriment for the want of them. The Church too, is a very clever institution. It is important, to the end that the preached gospel may be secured, and efforts put forth for the salvation of souls. It is well to be in connection with the Church; but not a matter of any very great importance. Many souls reach heaven out of it. Only so they have the Bible, and by reading it are brought to repent and exercise faith in Christ—all which must be done at any rate, before the Church can be of any benefit to them—it is a matter of small moment, touching the soul's salvation, whether they ever connect themselves with it or not.

Such in a general way, we may say, has come to be the sense in no small degree of the Protestant body. Of course many exceptions are happily to be found. Yet as a whole, it cannot be denied, but that it has lost all confidence in anything like an objective church life. No spiritual authority is acknowledged but the Bible, and this is to be interpreted by each one for himself. The individual judgment is fully competent for this task, no matter if it does address itself to the work, under the bias of all manner of preconceived notions. In short, the understanding is the measure of truth, and all things, consequently must square to its rule. Faith has nothing to do in the interpretation of scripture. The understanding must do this alone; and then afterwards, faith is bound to subscribe to its conclusions under the penalty of the charge of infidelity. According to this view, faith consents to truth, not as apprehended by its own power, but as presented and certified by the finite understanding; although Paul who is of *some* authority upon such points, conceives faith to be its own evidence; he says it (faith) is *the evidence* of things not seen.

The tendency of this rationalistic spirit is to run out into the most iniquitous extremes, as has been realized in but too many instances already. Having laid down the fundamental proposition that christianity is but doctrine, to be apprehended by the understanding, it has proceeded to bring everything down to its level. No room consequently is left for mystery. Even the doctrine of the Trinity, not to mention others, must divest itself of this character and become perfectly comprehensible. As a matter of course, three cannot be one, nor one, three; therefore Christ is not God. But one more step remains to be taken to develope its last consequence—nor has it been left untried by some at least—which is, that all religion is a farce, sin a dream, and man what he ought to be, acting in obedience to the impulses of that nature, which just as it is, is the handiwork of God. Thus does this theory run out, in the form of reflection.

Its practical workings are ultimately no less dreadful. Denying at the start the authority, nay, even the existence of the objective, every thing becomes subjective. Doctrine is not supposed to have any vital relation to christian experience. It is held to be something foreign—a mere appendage. There are points which for some reason are made to be essential to salvation, but so far as the understanding can see, they are very few in number. Upon most points it is a matter of perfect indifference what a man believes, only so he has the proper subjective exercises—so “he feels right.” This is the *sine qua non*—the unadulterated essence of religion itself. This again is taken to be the direct workings of the Spirit of God. The more intensely, therefore, any one *feels*, the brighter the evidence of his favor in the sight of God. That the feeling should at times become too intense to be contained, is altogether reasonable, being divinely wrought. In such cases they ought to be expressed in the way they may happen to seek utterance. To attempt to repress them, is to strive against the Spirit. Thus is the door opened to all forms of fanaticism.

Again—this *doctrine*, which is the outward form of christianity in the sense just described, is to be determined by every man for himself, as he understands the Bible. If his understanding be affirmed by any existing creed, to that he bows assent. If however he find no such an one, then verily are all wrong, and he alone right. If his circumstances—no matter for education—justify the step, he must needs proclaim himself a reformer, and establish a Church which alone enjoys the preaching of the gospel in its *purity*. Here we have the sect system—the practical expression of the notion which animates this whole ultra-movement.

Now in all truth this is any thing but patience. Indeed it is absolutely excluded, in favor of impatience—an imagined superiority to all authority, all law. And yet such is at least the tendency, if not indeed in many cases, the actual form of the Protestant element, in the way of extreme movement. And what renders this state of things still more deplorable, is the fact that we have no right to think that the movement has yet reached its culminating point. The present indication of things, rebukes such a fond imagination. The aspect, just at this time, of the political horizon—for it must be borne in mind, that humanity as a whole is the subject of this historical process—gives a most portentous promise of approaching evil. The prevailing idea seems to be, that the powers that be are ordained of the Devil, and not of God—that inasmuch as man is bound to submit to no authority, but of his own creation, he is at liberty to throw off all existing restraints, assert his natural right of absolute self-will, and then dispose of himself as he may deem proper. In full harmony with this, we find persons of a certain stamp, who, happily having outstripped their less fortunate brethren, have attained the glorious eminence of truth, where all government vanishes into smoke, and all restraint is discovered to be oppression. But one step higher in their case, and doubtless they will arrive at the full persuasion, that it is the will of God, to have every man do precisely as he pleases.

What will be the ultimate issue of this tendency, God alone can tell. Yet cannot one well avoid venturing a conjecture. A recent writer¹ of unusual ability, has with much good reason, supposed this movement to be the revelation of the man of sin, spoken of by Paul in 2 Thes. ii, and its final issue to consist in the revelation of “that Wicked,” “whom the Lord shall consume, with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.” As very justly observed, in the same connection, in translating the word rendered in our English version, “that Wicked,” “we lose a confirmation of this view, which this word more accurately rendered would give us. He is not simply the *wicked* one, but *ὁ ἀνομος* the *lawless* one; and the mystery is not merely a mystery of iniquity but of lawlessness (*ἀνομίας*).” He seems to think, that what we have seen to be the perversion of the Protestant element, is the final Antichrist, who is to exalt himself “above all that is called God,”

¹ Trench, Hul. Lec., page 147.

and show "himself that he is God," whose destruction is to be in the event of the coming of our Lord.

There is much to invest this opinion with plausibility. The "lawless one," does most certainly seem to meet his identification in the spirit of insubordination with which the Church and the world are filled, and besides, this lawless spirit is the perversion of the principle of patience, which according to the Apostle Peter is the last period in the advance of the restoration of man to the image of God—godliness as he expresses it; during which last period, we may not greatly err in supposing the advent of that Lord will take place, the brightness of whose coming will be the destruction of Antichrist.

From this review of the whole subject we arrive at this conclusion: That Protestantism and Romanism, as the embodiment respectively of the two great elements of that liberty wherewith Christ came to set us free, are not *inherently* inimical to each other—that each embodies, in the midst of all its errors, its most precious truth, which is the complement of the other—that to destroy one, were it possible, would be to inflict a most grievous injury upon the other—that each one is absolutely necessary to the perfection of the other. While all this is true, yet are they violently held asunder by the sinfulness of humanity, which sin has rushed each to the opposite extreme from the other. The duty, consequently growing out of this relation is, that each one be concerned primarily with its own defects and sins, not however despising the friendly offices of the other; (and especially is this applicable to Protestantism just at this time, when it is manifest that we have more to fear from perversion on this side, than we have from the errors and corruptions on the other,)—that in no event should one attempt the wholesale destruction of the other; but in all controversy, carefully to discriminate between truth and error, and seek to deliver the first, wherever found, from the just condemnation of the last. So then at length, when each shall have accomplished its separate mission, they may happily be brought to a joyful marriage, and present to Christ at his coming the world redeemed, and the Church in outward body one, as ever it has been in inward life, in the form of godliness. And out of this shall grow in due course of development, brotherly-kindness, and that last and greatest of christian graces, charity.

Jefferson, Md.

S. N. C.

•

PHILOSOPHY OF PERSECUTION.¹

THE history of Persecution is prolific of phenomena which are not more lamentable, then they are startling to the inquiring mind. The mere *fact* that man is so prone to intolerance of the opinions of his fellow-man, especially in the sphere of religion, and that he can exult with furious delight over a victory won by means of the rack, the faggot and the axe, is a fact at once curious and startling. This fact and the attending phenomena have been viewed differently by different minds, according to their respective points of observation. The philosophical indifferentists of the English and French schools, and a large class of religious sentimentalists such as St. Pierre and Fenelon, have, respectively, ridiculed or wept over *man's unaccountable madness*; while others, with more virulence, reckon these phenomena as the legitimate fruit of the religious principle, as though the religious principle were the artificial product of priestcraft, and not an essential element of human nature.

In endeavoring to account for the persecuting spirit, we may say in one word that it springs from the *depravity* of human nature. The schism between God and man was necessarily and speedily followed by a schism in humanity itself, by which its forces were arrayed in malignant antagonism. The commandment second in importance, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," follows not only in the order of time, but in the order of sequence, upon the first and greatest, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God." And not less legitimately does hatred towards man follow from hatred towards God. The persecuting spirit is utterly irreconcilable with the primitive condition of man, as tradition and nature hint at, and scripture reveals it, and can be accounted for properly, only in connection with a *lapsus* of the race. But as the fall introduced no new elements into our nature, but only disturbed and distorted those already existing, we will endeavor to trace the phenomena of persecution a little more closely.

We may say with safety, that every great historical phenomenon springs from some deep, abiding principle of our nature: and when it assumes a malignant or destructive form, it is only

¹ The historic material used in the preparation of the present article was derived from the following sources:—*Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History*; *Neander's History of the Christian Religion and Church*; *Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*; and *Milman's History of Christianity*.

the abuse, the abnormal development, of some legitimate, or properly human principle or tendency. There is no such thing as a general movement in society, no matter how wild and irregular, that is untraceable to some principle of our nature, any more than there is a wild, swollen, inundating river, that cannot be traced to some fountain head. True, there may be many collateral influences. The original principle may be almost lost sight of amid the multitude of adjuncts which conduce to the final result, just as the river may have many collateral branches which furnish the great body of water which gathers towards its mouth.

It may aid us in this inquiry if we premise, that persecution has not been confined to the religious world. It has raged in the spheres of politics, philosophy, science; everywhere indeed that a difference of opinion was possible. To be heterodox in politics, in the days of the French Republic, was as dangerous as to be heterodox in religion, in the times of St. Bartholomew's eve. To be heterodox in philosophy, in the days of the Realists and Nominalists, was as uncomfortable, almost as dangerous, as to deny the dogma of transubstantiation in the days of Hincmar of Rheims. Heterodoxy in science, as the world judged, brought Galileo upon his knees before the tribunal of the Inquisition; and the discovery of fluxions was the occasion of no little persecuting rancor. If, then, we would discover a principle which lies at the bottom of all persecution, it must be a *human* principle. It must be expansive enough to cover the entire field of our nature, and capable of almost endless combination with the various lateral forces, which may determine the precise character of the phenomena. It must be universal in its applicability to every sphere of thought, and capable of adjusting itself to the national and ecclesiastical, as well as to the individual life. Whilst these conditions may be justly required of it, it is not required that the ultimate principle should account for all the phenomena. Large allowance must be made for adjunct and circumstantial influences, which may almost hide from view the primary, moving agency. The plastic power in nature is scarcely thought of, amid the circumstantial influences of rain and sunshine and changes of season. And yet this power moves the panorama of nature. It is not required of any pervading principle, that it shall be the alone sufficient cause of every varied manifestation. All that is demanded is the power of combination and adjustment, which circumstances may require. Historians find it necessary to discover different causes, for every separate outbreak of persecution since the world be-

gan. These are often purely accidental, and bear no relation or similarity perhaps in any two cases. These however are but the occasions, which call the deeper principles of our nature into play. There may be room even for the admission of Satanic agency. Such agency uses the powers of our nature as its instruments. The powers of darkness are able to accomplish nothing in the world, except as they wield to their own purposes the materials already existing. Even though we admit that every persecution through which the church has been called to pass, or which she has been tempted to perpetrate, was an effort on the part of the "prince of the power of the air" to prevail against her, yet must we admit that the artillery for the diabolical onset has been gathered from the arsenal of human nature. The unclean spirits, which "are the spirits of devils," "go forth unto the *kings of the earth*, and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty."

Let us assume, then, that the fontal source of the persecuting spirit is the *strong sense of individuality*, which underlies every man's feelings and actions, and see whether it will meet the conditions required. This, we conceive, is reducing the moving cause of the phenomena to its ultimate elements, its last degree of simplicity, and it may be difficult to retain so slender a thread amid the sanguinary and world-convulsing scenes through which we may be called to pass.

Every man, to a greater or less degree, considers himself the centre around which every thing in the shape of opinion ought to revolve. Every man has almost as much confidence in his own perceptions and logical deductions as in his senses, and he very naturally makes these the standard by which he measures the perceptions and deductions of others; and of course he cannot look with indifference upon any who pronounce them false. He feels that the foundations of his knowledge are being impaired. It is not easy to remain unmoved, when told that these mental progeny, these idols of the brain, are mere inane phantoms, if not the dark-visaged children of falsehood. A process of ratiocination which is perfectly clear to one man's mind, he is disposed to think, ought to be so to another's. This, it strikes us is the ultimate solution of the mighty war of opinion, which has ever convulsed the world; and the collateral aid of the malignant passions,—which is easily afforded by the close connection of our emotional with our rational nature,—is all that is needed, together with the necessary power, to give birth to the persecuting spirit in its most hideous and desolating forms. Take a homely illustration. A plain, thoughtful farmer meets

his neighbor at a partition fence, on a bright summer morning, and submits to him a proposition, perhaps in the sphere of vital truth, which he has reached through many hours of midnight thought and noonday musings, and which he has now elaborated and polished, until to his own vision it seems transparent as the light. The duller perception of the other cannot see it, or perhaps some previous bias leads him to spurn it. Then follows an effort to save the cherished idol, by exhibiting its claims and its beauties. Thought grapples with thought. Mind is pitted against mind. The passions come into play. And finally, if violence is not resorted to, the neighbors part with the mutual epithet of "fool." It requires a calm philosophy, the result of thoughtful culture, and wide views of man's more remote relations, to enable the ardent lover of truth to brook with perfect complacency a dogmatic difference of opinion. The same causes operate upon the masses of men. Organizations, whether social, political or religious, may be roused to violence in the same way as individuals. The world was more than five thousand years old, and European Civilization, with all the advantages of christianity, had toiled on for ages through blood and strife, before even the most enlightened portion of mankind learned the great principles of *toleration*. The discovery marked an epoch in the progress of humanity. It showed that a great stadium had been reached, in the ascent of the race to its final goal.

The outworkings of this principle may assume various phases; but all will be found more or less closely connected with the sense of individuality. The persecution of the few by the many, so common as to be almost proverbial, is not because the disposition to persecute is confined to the many, but because they possess the necessary power. The persecuting spirit is born in every man, who feels the shrine of his individuality invaded: and this the many feel, when the few possess or profess anything distinctive or exclusive.

Before proceeding to test the principle we have named by facts, let us inquire what is the *final cause* of the existence of such a principle in our nature? Why has God endowed us with a mental pugnacity so prolific of all that is evil and heart-rending? We answer, precisely because there is such a thing as *truth*, and the capacity on the part of man to perceive it; and such a thing as *error*, or incapacity to perceive truth or wilful perversion of it. The human mind is capable of perceiving truth, or arriving at it by logical deduction; and the perception or logical result is sure and unerring, in proportion to the gifts and acquirements possessed and the freedom from disturbing in-

fluences. And when man has thus found truth, or even fancies he has found it, it is the ordinance of God that he should speak it out and contend earnestly for it. The inherent strength of genuine truth will secure it the victory. It is this strife of intellect, this Olympic emulation of thought, which rolls forward the wheels of the world's progress. Errors, perverted truths, and all such abortive efforts of the wrestling mind, gradually fall back and are covered by the dust of the course, while the genuine treasures of truth are borne along and become incorporated into the knowledge of the race. And in the sphere of religion this strife is the fiercer, just because here is enshrined the most precious truth, and here are developed the most gross and hideous perversions. This is the sphere, not only of the highest speculative truth, but also of *revealed* truth; and this is to be defended as well as believed. This duty the christian and the Church must discharge. Nor is this duty entrusted to the force of a mere injunction, operating upon the man mechanically from without. A connection has been wisely ordained between its discharge and the feeling of individuality; so as to furnish a motive power from the deep arcana within. A man's opinions, much more his religion, become part of himself. They are cherished and defended with the same jealousy that guards the citadel of his own being. To touch them is to touch himself. Not that we would teach that we are purely selfish beings. The current bad sense of the term "selfishness" makes it inapplicable, to describe the relation wisely instituted between our actions and ourselves. The grasp of religion upon our individuality in the way spoken of is the stronger, because it is fraught with the most startling and momentous personal consequences..

The fact that this principle applies in the case of error as well as truth does not vitiate it. On this equal footing, in this fair contest, as it has been wisely ordered, "truth is mighty and will prevail." Though the forces of humanity may be as available for the service of error as of truth, yet is it neither irrational nor unphilosophical to rest the triumph of the latter upon the wisdom of Him who "turneth the hearts of men as the rivers of waters are turned."

This enlistment of the selfish principle—using it in its better sense—does not destroy the sense of responsibility as resting upon the man from without. Both go together; and the latter is pressing in proportion as the former is absorbing. A remarkable proof of the power with which this responsibility took hold of the mind of the primitive Church, is exhibited in the fearful *anathemas* with which not only general councils, but petty

synods and even single bishops, prefaced their statements of fundamental doctrines; and yet, in this defence of the truth as it is in Jesus, the sense of individuality was as much enlisted, as though it had been a warfare *pro aris et focis*. Persecution is only the perverted, abnormal development of this principle, when the soil from which it springs is poisoned and imbittered by superstition, bigotry or unholy ambition. It then assumes functions which do not belong to it. While God commands us to "contend earnestly for the faith," he gives us no authority to punish.

The persecuting spirit, thus springing from the perverted working of the principle of individuality, may assume different types or phases, according to the point of impingement upon the sense of individuality, by which the direction of the rebound is determined. It may assume the type of pure jealousy, the offspring of a selfishness which can brook no rival. Or it may be the result of fear,—the convulsive effort to crush a rival, whose threatened ascendancy is dreaded. Again it may arise from pure malignity, the fiendish principle of hate, the existence of which has been rendered possible by the schism in human nature. Much of the blood of the French Revolution flowed to appease demons incarnate, who hated their kind. One of the most inhuman butcheries of the Reign of Terror, which made the streets of Lyons flow with noble and virtuous blood, resulted, in no slight degree, from the fact that ten years before Collot d'Herbois had been hissed off the stage as an indifferent comedian. Sometimes indeed the sense of individuality may account for the absence of persecution. Where there is a feeling of confidence, a consciousness of strength and security, and a self-sufficiency which looks down with contempt upon all difference of opinion, there may be little stimulant to persecution. As an instance in point, Frederick the Great may be cited, who gave a similar welcome, and afforded an indiscriminate shelter, to all forms of religion and irreligion within his dominions. And yet there were points in which his individuality might be invaded, and to do so was most hazardous. A similar reference might be made to the strong, iron-nerved Roman Governor, who said, "I have found no fault in him," and yet delivered up the Just One, with the cool remark, "see ye to it."

Having thus defined what the principle is which we propose, and having seen what is, and what is not, required to establish it, let us proceed to test it by facts; to discover if we can, by glancing at some of the leading persecutions which history records, the connection between it and the actual phenomena.

We shall confine ourselves principally, for the sake of brevity and clearness, to the persecutions which christianity elicited and endured, in its contact with the old forms of religion.

Let us trace first the persecuting spirit of the Jew against Christianity.

The mission of the Jewish nation as the conservator of God's blessings and promises, and the peculiar sactions and restrictions by which this character was preserved, necessarily nurtured to its highest degree the feeling of exclusiveness and nationality. There was little room for sympathy with the unchosen and uncircumcised. And if it be true that a man's opinions and his religion become part of himself, the connection between the feeling of nationality—the religious nationality of the Jew especially—and the sense of individuality is manifest. The former is the development or expansion of the latter. A man becomes identified with his nation, and to carp at his nationality, is to arouse the ire of self. Now on this side precisely did christianity impinge upon the individuality of the Jew. It proclaimed itself a universal religion. It broke down the middle wall of partition, between the religious and rigid nationalism of Judaism, and the outside nations of the uncircumcised. It proclaimed that the blessings which had heretofore been confined to the chosen nation, and watched with such jealous care, were now to become the common heritage of all men. It did away the sanctity of particular localities. The bitterest complaint against the great Apostle of the Gentiles was, that he “had gone about to profane the Temple,” which was the centre around which their nationalism clustered; and the bitterest scoff against the bleeding Redeemer was, “Thou that destroyest the Temple.” With this feeling of nationalism, and Pharisaic sanctity and exclusiveness, the Jew was prepared for fierce intolerance and relentless persecution. A fine example in point is furnished by Paul himself, before his conversion. He was the very embodiment of Jewish nationalism and Pharisaic self-exaltation; and with these christianity came into collision. Part of the change which occurred in his life, consisted in removing this exclusiveness, releasing his mind from the trammels of Judaism, and at the same time enabling him to regard not himself, for the sake of the Gospel of Christ. His individuality was turned in a new direction. Christianity now became, as it were, bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. And this change subjected him to the same malign influences in his brethren, which had formerly wrought upon himself. The defection of a partisan is always a sore thrust at the heart of self. A careful perusal of the Acts

of the Apostles will, we think, make manifest the principle stated, that Jewish persecution of christianity resulted from the rebound of the selfish principle, invaded upon the side of their nationality and religion.

Let us turn now to the persecution of christianity by the Romans.

The Roman also had a peculiarly strong national feeling. In Rome the Political element was in the ascendant. The State was regarded as the realization of the highest good. The cloud-throned Zeus of the Greeks was baptized Jupiter Capitolinus. Everything in that huge, world-conquering fabric, was calculated to excite national pride and inflame the love of country. The banner under which the Roman fought, whether it flashed in the beams of the Orient, or fluttered amid the forests of Gaul, or waved over the snows of Britain, was inscribed with the initials of "Senatus, Populusque Romani." Everywhere the magic words "Romanus sum," threw around the man who uttered them an invisible armour of protection. Bound thus to the state by such strong and tender ties, an indignity offered to Rome was an indignity offered to the Roman.

The Roman has been called tolerant; and a show of facts seems to substantiate it. But a careful scrutiny will discover, that he was tolerant only when there was no call to intolerance. Roman toleration was altogether the result of circumstances. The state being regarded as the realization of the highest good, almost anything could be tolerated, which did not infringe upon this; but an infringement upon this was resented with merciless sternness. "Worship the Gods in all respects according to the laws of your country, and compel all others to do the same." "Suffer no man to deny the Gods." Such was the advice of Maecenas to Augustus. "Whoever introduced new religions, the tendency and character of which were unknown, whereby the minds of men might be disturbed, should, if belonging to the higher rank, be banished; if to the lower, punished with death," was a ruling principle of civil law. Nevertheless, the Gods of other nations were conciliated; but in such a manner as that the policy of the state was not compromised. The conquered divinities were received with due honor into the Roman Capitol. Men of a thousand nations were found in Rome, quietly worshipping their own Gods according to the laws at home, when christianity claimed a resting place in the great city. This however was the condescension of the conquerors to the conquered. No Roman citizen could join in the observ-

ance of any such foreign rites, without a special decree of the Senate.

It was impossible, from the very nature of the case, that this condescending toleration should be extended to christianity. It infringed upon the idea of nationality. It did not recognize the state as the realization of the highest good. It claimed not an asylum as the religion of any nation. It came as a conqueror. It spoke of a kingdom which was not the Roman empire; —a universal kingdom, and it called upon the proud mistress of the world to bow to its sceptre. The new converts seemed to renounce their family and country that they might connect themselves in an indissoluble bond of union, with a peculiar society which every where assumed a different character from the rest of mankind. The whole body of christians unanimously refused to hold any communion with the Gods of Rome, of the empire, and of mankind. They would have nothing to do with Jupiter Capitolinus. Nothing but collision could be expected, when the professors of such a doctrine were brought face to face with the Cæsars. Nero saw at a glance, that there was something in their position, which was incompatible with his. This kingdom was an anomaly, which could not safely co-exist with his government. And the more nearly that government approached the character of a military despotism, the more fierce must the contest between it and the spiritual kingdom necessarily become. One or the other must fall. Christianity thus impinged upon the individuality of the throned Cæsar, and the percussion was felt to some extent by every one connected with the government, in proportion as he realized the position of the two antagonistic powers. One of Pliny's tests was the making of offerings to the statue of the emperor. Cyprian was beheaded "as the enemy of the Gods of Rome, and as the chief and ringleader of a criminal association, which he had seduced into an impious resistance against the laws of the most holy emperors Valerian and Gallienus." The Neronian persecution was no more an accident resulting from the burning of Rome, as Milman calls it, than the Reformation was an accident resulting from the commission of 'Tetzel to sell indulgences in Germany. The christians were already objects of popular and imperial hatred, and this hatred arose from deeper causes than any that could be called accidental.

The incompatibility of christianity with the dominion of the Cæsars was felt, not only by the impious and jealous Nero, but by the more humane and philosophical emperors. The humanity of Marcus Aurelius might dispose him to compassionate the

suffering christians, but his Stoicism presented no point of congeniality to the claims of christianity. In Stoicism the sense of individuality reached its climacteric; although exhibited in the anomalous form of the abnegation and annihilation of self. These after all were but manifestations of self-reliance. Marcus Aurelius felt, perhaps more than any other, the intrusion of christianity into the sanctuary of self. He persecuted with the cool self-complacency of the philosopher.

Influences leading to the same result might be traced, more or less clearly, as acting upon Trajan, and upon his governor Pliny, and upon the other persecuting emperors, especially Galerius and Dioclesian. The fifty years of repose which the christians enjoyed previous to the Dioclesian persecution, had so much increased their number and influence, as to awaken anew the Pagan mind to the danger which threatened the old institutions. The bigoted and fanatical Galerius felt this influence in all its force, and he was eager to shed the blood of the hated sect; and nothing could have moved the cautious and experienced statesman, Dioclesian, to engage in persecution, but appeals to his personal safety and honor, the fallacy of which he was not discerning enough to see. It might be shown also, that Julian's toleration did not result from the absence of these influences or his insensibility to them, but from a discriminating and worldly-wise policy. He occupied a position from which he could learn the lesson, that persecution usually fails of its object. He was far sighted enough to perceive a principle, which has now been pretty clearly visible to the civilized world generally for nearly two centuries—to which vision however the civilized world attained by the most gradual steps.

Time forbidding to pursue this particular investigation, let us consider the point of collision between christianity and the *masses* of the Roman world. Among the common people must the ultimate motive-power be sought, which moved the wheel of persecution in the majority of instances. The rulers were often the mere tools or instruments. They were obliged to yield to the pressure from below, and deliver over to death the followers of the Nazarene, as Pontius Pilate had their Master.

One point of collision we have already noticed—the Roman nationality. Another, when the friction was stronger than in the case of the rulers, and where the invasion of the individuality of the Roman was more galling, was on the side of his religion. The old Roman was a man of religion; and although in the Augustan age much of the ancient reverence and devotion had given way to scepticism and indifference, which were

sapping the foundations of the old superstitions, as luxury and profligacy were sapping the foundations of the empire, yet these influences were comparatively little felt in the lower strata of society. Hence the Lares and Penates were still dear as when father Anchises was carried from the flames of Troy; and christianity branded these as idle toys. The sacrifices were still thought propitiatory or pleasing to the gods, as when Æneas found the aged Evander upon the banks of the Tiber, engaged in the sacred rites of Hercules; and christianity pulled down the altars. The temples and sacred groves were still viewed as the abodes of divinity, and these christianity profaned. The Pagans contemplated with awe and reverence the gorgeous system of mythology, starting in the depths of a hoary antiquity with those superhuman heroes, who, in the infancy of the world, had invented arts, instituted laws, and vanquished the tyrants or monsters which infested the earth; and this gilded fabric christianity declared an inane phantom, and instead of these demi-gods offered a crucified Jewish malefactor. The Roman's religion was inseparably connected with outward show and pageant; the christian had none of this, and the Roman regarded him as a God-abandoned atheist. The christian contemned the superstitions of his family, his city, and his province; and he was branded as a hater of his kind. The anger of the gods might well be supposed to hang over such an impious sect; and if the Roman tolerated it, he might expect his own home to be unsettled or desolated by the earthquake or the pestilence. He felt that the rights of toleration, vague as was his apprehension of them, were forfeited by any sect who thus separated themselves from gods and men. It will be seen that here were numerous points in which the Roman individuality would be infringed on every side. To touch his religion was to touch himself.

That it was the religious principle which was invaded, is seen from the manner in which alone his ire could be appeased. The great test was to sacrifice to, or worship the gods, or blaspheme Christ. "You may obtain pardon of our emperors," said the pro-consul Saturninus to the Numidian christians, "if in good earnest you will return to our gods."

Between the philosopher, also, and christianity there was a grating point of collision. Pride of opinion and philosophic self-sufficiency could not easily succumb to the humbling doctrines of the cross. Christianity ignored the proud wisdom of the world. It proclaimed the doctrine of a spiritual, unseen Supreme Being, to be a doctrine for all men: while the aristo-

cratic few supposed themselves alone capable of elevating their minds to the contemplation of the great First Cause. Even Plato had warned them that it was "dangerous to publish the knowledge of the true God." If the religious Roman was chagrined, to find himself robbed of his altars and his Penates, and his hoary system of mythology stripped of its reality, the philosophic Roman was chagrined to find his gilded system of speculation eviscerated of its truthfulness and power. The long list of teachers of mankind, from Orpheus, to the elder Pliny, to be vanquished by the illiterate fishermen of Galilee!

Besides, christianity precisely contradicted the highest idea the Roman world had attained of an external religion. That idea was the national form of religion. Christianity proclaimed itself a religion for mankind, irrespective of all nationality. "The noblest fruit of piety," writes Porphyry to his wife, "is to worship God after the manner of one's country." "The man that can believe it possible," says Celsus, "for Greeks and Barbarians, in Asia, Europe and Lybia, to agree in one code of religious laws, must be quite void of understanding." The result, gradually becoming apparent, seemed to cast back this stigma upon the philosopher himself. Christianity unwittingly twitched the philosophic beard, and Diogenes growled from his tub.

Thus we think a point of invasion of the individuality may be traced every where, by which, amid the political, collateral and accidental influences which evolved and moulded it, was moved the deepest under current of that deluge of persecution, which greeted the infant and growing church.

Did space permit we might trace minutely the growth of the persecuting spirit in the church herself, and find there indications of the same principle we have attempted to trace elsewhere. We might speak of christianity in its first periods as a form of love; in its practical working more an outgoing and blending of the emotions than afterwards; a subversion of *particularism*, a mutual surrender to some extent, or at least a modification of the sense of individuality. We might speak of it in its succeeding periods, as especially a witness for the truth, brought into contact with forms of error, called to defend the form of sound words received from the Apostolic teachers, engaged in a warfare which called forth at once into their highest activity the sense of responsibility and of individuality. We might speak of the stern and solemn decrees of councils and synods, uttered with a voice of intensity and earnestness, as though they felt they were placed to guard the shrine of the inner temple—a voice as thrilling as that of the Stygian vates. "Procul, O, procul este, pro-

fani!" We might show how the collateral influence of the malign emotions, outworking from the injured individuality, changed the action of opposing councils into vituperation, and marred the outward victory in this holy warfare by the dark stains of persecution.

We might notice the Protestant persecutions in England; the excommunication and banishment of *Dissenters*, by the proclamation of James I; the fires of Smithfield; the bloody rule of Charles I and Laud, when Leighton was fined ten thousand pounds, pilloried, whipped, imprisoned, had his ears cut off, his nose slit and his cheek branded with the letters SS, for writing a book *against the hierarchy*; and when a book *against sports* on the Lord's day cost William Prynne, barrister, his ears and five thousand pounds. Nor might we pass over the persecuting spirit of the Presbyterians, in the days of their power; their efforts to enforce *uniformity*, and to extirpate popery, prelacy, heresy, schism, &c. The Puritan individuality might furnish a fine subject for an artistic sketch. A brief reference might also be made to the persecution of Quakers, Baptists, and witches, in New England, by which the illustrious apostle of toleration was made an exile from home and country. We might dwell upon Mohammedan individuality and persecution, and upon the collision between christianity and existing systems of heathenism, as exemplified in the history of modern missions. We might cite the case of the Chinese, where we see developed simultaneously, to their highest pitches the sense of nationality and the sense of individuality, and where we find the most insuperable hostility to christianity. All this ground, however, would be quite too extensive for the limits of the present article, nor is it necessary to go over it to secure the *instantias convenientes* of Bacon.

But we cannot avoid noticing briefly the persecuting spirit of the church of Rome. The historical circumstances attendant upon and consequent from the fall of the old Roman Empire, co-operated to make Rome a great centre of ecclesiastical power. The Bishop became first the adviser and then the arbiter for the christian world. The spiritual greatness was a suitable counterpart to her ancient political greatness. During the noon-day of her dominion, extending from the pontificate of Innocent III to that of Boniface VIII inclusive, or through the 13th century, she inspired all the terror of her ancient name. She was once more the mistress of the world, and kings were her vassals. She was the arbiter of thought. Thousands, not only of stupid, passive souls, but of earnest, gifted minds, received the words

from her lips as the lively oracles of God. This position, connected with the consciousness that christianity craved after unity, begat an intense feeling of responsibility. The repository of Divine truth, the vice-gerent and high priest of God upon earth, must be also the guardian of this truth. She must not permit the sacred shrine to be profaned. The interpreter of the mind of the spirit must extinguish the false light of heretical doctrine. This position also developed to a high degree, in the church considered as a unique body, the sense of individuality. Conspicuous trust is always a sweet incense to the idol of self. She exalted herself as a queen upon the seven hills. From her there could be no appeal. Her thunders were decisive. Her utterances were oracular. The intoxication of power and the foul leaven of corruption wrought up this self-exaltation to a frantic madness; and her power was turned in a most malignant direction. The heretic must be burnt as the traducer and enemy of God, but he was burnt with a peculiar zest because he was the traducer and enemy of Rome. The reformer who carped at prevailing abuses carped at Rome herself. To assail what Rome taught as the truth of God was to impugn and assail the teacher herself. Here was room for the influx of all the malign emotions which the most zealous Protestant could desire, to insure the identity of Antichrist, and for all the Satanic agency necessary to complete the picture of him, "whose coming is after the working of Satan." A striking characteristic of Antichrist is an abnormal development of the selfish principle. "He exalteth *himself* above all that is called God or that is worshipped."

As political Rome nurtured to its full growth the national feeling, and took up in it and secured the service of the individual feeling, so spiritual Rome nurtured the Church feeling, considered as the feeling of party, and thus enlisted the individual feeling by fastening her hold upon the religious susceptibilities. Her agencies and tactics for this purpose display an almost superhuman skill. Never before nor since has the world seen such willing, faithful and effective servants of a great central power. "If I forget thee, O Society of Jesus," exclaimed Xavier in India, "let my right hand forget her cunning." Rome thus secured everywhere multitudes of willing minds, and ready hands, to accomplish her purposes. It is idle to think of securing such unswerving fealty in any cause, without enlisting the individuality. Disobedience or insult to Rome grated irritatingly upon thousands of devoted and jealous hearts, and multitudes of injured vassals stood ready with fire and faggot,

awaiting her nod, to avenge the wrong. And then, besides this strong fealty, the individuality of every zealous Romanist was enlisted in behalf of the Roman teachings, as part of his own mental wealth. No matter how gratuitously a man may receive his opinions, he does not fail to regard and defend them as his own.

Thus we think the workings of the selfish principle, grasped and distorted upon the side of the religious nature, may be traced with more than ordinary clearness in the persecuting spirit of that Church which commissioned Dominic and Manfort to butcher the Albigenses, compelled Galileo to deny that the world turned round, shut out for weary years the free air of heaven from the pious Gotteschalc in the dungeons of France, burned Huss and dug up the bones of Wickliffe.

We have not contended that the principle proposed accomplishes everything. As premised in the early part of this article, the collateral influences may almost hide it from view. All we assert is that it is one always present principle. Nor, when speaking of those who have cherished the persecuting spirit, have we intended that they should be invariably regarded as monsters of depravity. We have contended, that persecution is only the *abuse* of a right principle; and this, we think, derives strong confirmatory proof from the character of some of those who have practised it. Whilst it is true that a signal abuse of such a principle, through the influx of the malign emotions, is likely to be, and has been, connected with great moral deformity in every view, yet it is on the other hand an indisputable fact, that some of the best of men have sanctioned the punishment of errors in opinion. Many a ghastly president of the Inquisition, whose face told of intense mental conflict, and from whose sunken eye shot forth an unearthly glare, was a man who slept five hours and prayed seven! Even the lovely Pascal was an advocate for the principle, that "heretics should be punished by the civil power;" and a suspicious stain rests upon the victorious escutcheon of the great Genevan himself.

Persecution in its bloody forms has long been unknown in the christian world. Why is this? Not because the sense of individuality is wanting, or less strong than ever, but because it is turned in new directions. The collateral influences are wanting to turn it into its old channels. The influences calculated to counteract and repress the malign emotions, and broader views of man's relations, growing out of the general state of the world and of christianity, are strong enough to prevent the grosser outbreaks of persecution. It may have assumed subtler forms,

and an unexpected change of circumstances might develop its old phenomena; but we cannot help thinking that now, more than ever before, the true principle in both its aspects has rooted itself in the consciousness of mankind,—the abuse separated from the use. So may it ever be!

II. The second general aspect in which we purpose to view Persecution is in its *influence upon the church*. We shall confine ourselves to persecution as *suffered* by the Church,—we take it for granted that a persecuting spirit, overleaping the limits of a legitimate defence of the faith, *in* the Church can only be deleterious.

The aphorism of Tertullian, that “the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church,” has come down to us with the venerable sanctity of a proverb; and it has the more claim to regard, as being a voice from the very midst of persecution itself:—the exclamation of a man, who saw the results which followed in its devastating track. The proverb doubtless contains an important and significant truth, but it needs limitation and explanation. It is only at certain times, and under certain circumstances, that persecution could possibly exert a salutary influence upon the Church. To a pure Church, or a Church so situated as to be unable to scatter abroad among unconverted nations; or to a Church whose special vocation at any particular time required undisturbed unity of action, and calm, thoughtful repose, persecution could be of no conceivable benefit, but must prove terribly disastrous. But believing that God is in history as well as in nature, and that He controls the phenomena of mind as well as of matter, we may assure ourselves that upon such a Church her great Head will never allow the hand of persecution to be laid. Persecution can only be beneficial to a *corrupt*, or an *inactive* Church;—to a Church which needs *purification* or *dispersion*.

Persecution then we would call a *necessary evil*. We call it an *evil*, because it is attended with trial and suffering, and actual loss of life to the Church. And we call it a *necessary* evil, because, owing to the present fallen state of the world, and corresponding imperfect state of the Church, it is required at certain times, to enable the Church to attain the final end of her mission. That there is such a class of necessary evils will hardly be doubted; and their existence is an enigma which forms but one phase of the great enigma of the presence of evil in the world. A severe, prostrating sickness is an evil, *per se*, but it may be demanded in certain states of the system, to purify and re-invigorate it. The amputation of a diseased limb is an evil,

per se, but it may be necessary in order to save life. The existence of prisons and penitentiaries and gallows is a very bad thing; but the sanctity of the law, and the safety of society, demand them. To say that these things, on account of their ultimate good, are not evils but blessings, is mere quibbling, trifles with the intuitions of consciousness, and if carried out destroys the moral distinction between right and wrong.

The history of the Christian Church, during the first three centuries of its existence, as it has furnished us the facts in testing the principle proposed, so it furnishes a fair instance of the necessity and legitimate influence of persecution, under the providence of God. Let us examine the benefits which resulted from it.

1. It was beneficial for *purifying* the Church. Just think, for one moment, of the elements from which the Church must form itself. It was planted down amidst the debasement and blindness of heathenism; and at a time when the Roman Empire, though outwardly dazzling and prosperous, was festering with the loathsome corruption which hastened its fall. The Apostle Paul, in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, gives us a graphic and startling picture of the general state of the heathen world, with special reference to Rome, and the pages of Tacitus and his contemporaries fully confirm its truthfulness. The ancient age of sterling human virtue had passed, and an age of luxurious effeminacy and gilded rottenness had succeeded.

“ She saw her glories star by star expire.”

A former age had witnessed the deification of Concord and Faith and Modesty. Venus Verticordia presided over the purity of domestic morals, and the most virtuous woman in Rome was chosen to dedicate her statue. But now the worship of the heart had ceased to sanctify these impersonations of human virtues, the moral tone of society was relaxed, and the deities became cold abstractions. Even the sacred rites became defiled with unspeakable pollutions. Besides the popular system had lost its hold upon the educated mind. The golden age of imagination, in which the awe-struck mind listened with trembling belief to the wildest fables, and lived in the deep feeling of the sublime and the beautiful, had yielded to an iron age of reason. The deities of poetry humanized had lost all worship of the heart, among the unbelieving aristocracy. Philosophy had proposed to refine the popular religion into a more rational creed, if not to offer itself as a substitute. “ The popular religions of

antiquity," says Neander, "answered only for a certain stage of culture. When the nations in the course of their progress had passed beyond this, the necessary consequence was a dissevering of the spirit from the religious traditions." "The world," says D'Aubigne, "was tottering on its old foundations, when christianity appeared. The various religions which had sufficed for an earlier age, no longer satisfied the nations. The mind of the existing generation could no longer tabernacle in the ancient forms. The gods of the nations had lost their oracles—as the nations had lost their liberty in Rome. Brought face to face in the Capitol, they had mutually destroyed the illusion of their divinity. A vast void had ensued in the religious opinions of mankind." Claiming, as the Church did, to fill the void, bearing the highest hopes and spiritual inducements for man, it would have been a miracle, had there been no restraining check, if multitudes had not sought a place within her pale, who only covered the hideous corse of Paganism with the garb of christianity. Such a check was furnished by the impingement of christianity upon the heathen mind, and the results that followed. Persecution was thus a *sifting* or *winnowing* process to separate the chaff from the wheat, and save christianity from a total divestiture of its distinctive character. With all the checks and safeguards thrown around it, the religion of Christ could not remain intact in its conflict with the religions of man; without these—had it assumed a position of quiet cohabitation—we see not how it could have retained its peculiarities and its power. The perilous tendency to deterioration showed itself strongly, after the fires of persecution had been finally extinguished. The Pagan party became strong in the Church. The wise and thoughtful Gregory of Nazianzen writes, at the beginning of Julian's reign, that "the Church had more to fear from its enemies within than from those without." And in fact the partial triumph of Julian was possible, only because the Pagan party had gathered such alarming strength in the bosom of the Church. The blind zeal of Constantius, which led him beyond the true limit in his efforts to suppress paganism and establish christianity, had caused many to assume hypocritically the profession of christianity, while at heart they were still inclined to paganism. In order to retain favor at court, they were willing to exchange a few pagan for christian names, from which position a retreat back to paganism would be easy when the time for reaction came. We repeat it, the persecution of the first three centuries was necessary to save the Church.

2. It was beneficial for the *spread* of the Church : i. e. the

increase of *true* believers. We are told that when the persecution arose about Stephen, the christians were scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, and travelled as far as Phenice and Cyprus and Antioch, preaching the word, and that a great multitude believed and turned unto the Lord. Doubtless this stringent agency was necessary, to break the force of local attachments, which kept the body of the disciples in the neighborhood of the holy city. The time having come that christianity should burst the bonds of Jewish exclusiveness, it was of great advantage that the divine leaven should begin to work simultaneously at many points, in the Gentile world. This result the persecution which Stephen elicited effected, as the tempest scatters over a continent the seed which otherwise would fall around the root of the parent stock. Similar was the effect of the Roman persecutions, especially that of Dioclesian. Thousands of christians took refuge in the neighboring barbarian tribes, and in some cases left results behind them, which told upon the entire future history of the Church. A similar event has occurred in modern times. We refer to the landing of the pilgrims at the rock of Plymouth ! This dispersive agency indeed seems to have been one of those much employed by Providence, in the administration of the Church. Human instruments must be operated upon by motives, which appeal to human susceptibilities. The Israelites had to be prepared for a cheerful exodus from Egypt, by the severity of their task-masters.

And the scenes of martyrdom themselves, while they drove pseudo-christians out of the Church, and deterred hypocrites from entering it, operated powerfully upon the bystanders, to lead them to a just and true appreciation of and sympathy for christianity, and by the Holy Spirit were made a means of opening the eyes of many to their need of salvation. A martyr, whether in a good or a bad cause, always carries power in his agonies to reflecting minds ; and this mainly because of the spontaneous conviction, so natural to the mind, that nothing but truth can bear up the spirit of martyrdom to the final issue. That the number of true christians increased under persecution, we have the express testimony, not only of the too extravagant Tertullian, but of Basil of Cesarea and others of the early fathers.

3. Persecution was beneficial, in *drawing forth the resources* of the Church. It is a well known principle in human nature, that opposition stimulates to greater exertion, and that great and critical emergencies are necessary, to develop the highest strength

of character. A certain amount of pressure is required, in order to bring all the energies of the man into actual operation. Placed as we are in the midst of a world, where the action must perpetually be adapted to the time and the circumstances, this characteristic seems inseparable from the conditions of our human existence. Our natures might be likened to the famous bridge, on which the conquering Roman passed the Rhine; the harder the current presses, the more firmly, within certain limits, are the joints knit in resistance. There is no reason, why this principle should not have all its force in the sphere of religion. The same conditions surround us here as everywhere else; and the energy aroused is the more intense, because of the vital nature of that of which opposition would rob us. Perhaps no man prizes his religion sufficiently, until called to part with it. To make him so prize it, is the effect of persecution. The true christian's religion then becomes a thing of stern and strong reality, and he clings to it with invincible tenacity. Then, too, as in every other sphere, does the emergency develop striking instances of individual character. That great men are the product of the age, is a truth often uttered in these latter days. Circumstances do much in the formation of character. It were hard to make expert sailors, did storms never toss the billows and howl through the masts. In times of persecution, strong and fearless spirits rise up to serve as beacons for the agonizing Church. A type of character is then developed, which it would be impossible to produce amid the luxury of repose. Mariners tell us of a bird, the petrel, whose wild shriek is heard only amid the roar of the storm. So, *mutatis mutandis*, in the storm of persecution, the voice of the master spirits of the Church is heard to comfort and cheer. Such were the noble Bishop Martyrs, and the staunch and intrepid Apologists of the early Church. Besides, we must make large account for the special presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church, at such times of her history. It is precisely in accordance with the promises of God's word, and the plan of God's dealings with her. A purifying and recuperative process is only indicative of his careful affection for her. Though she must be purged, she must never perish. While he afflicts with one hand, he upholds with the other. When the three men were cast into the burning fiery furnace, the form of one like to the Son of God was seen walking with them through its midst. God's promise to the typical Jacob has received its deepest verification, in the history of the Church: "When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee; and through the rivers they shall not overflow thee;

when thou walkest through the fire thou shalt not be burned, neither shall the flame kindle upon thee. For I am the Lord thy God, the Holy one of Israel thy Saviour." (Is. 43: 2)

But here we are met with the evasion, that *any sect* will grow under persecution; and that consequently the evidence in behalf of christianity, derived from its history, is of no avail. On this premise then, it would seem that all that is necessary to make any form of opinion universally prevalent, is to persecute it effectually. But this bears absurdity upon its very face. It is impossible, that the incidental circumstance of persecution should give anything a permanent dominion over the human mind, which contained no inherent principle of power. It were as rational to suppose, that exciting stimulants could serve as a permanent substitute for a healthy stomach. Persecution may excite a temporary, spasmodic strength, even where the inherent power is feeble, but it can never serve as a substitute for inherent life and power. Because a certain plant gains vigor by being trampled upon, it were a fallacy fatal to gardeners to conclude that trampling would insure the healthy growth of all plants. No man will long suffer for false doctrine. Falsehood begets no sustaining enthusiasm, prolific of martyrs. Deists may have been disfranchised, or atheists guillotined; but deism or atheism has little power of compensation for such sacrifices, and rarely reaps a harvest from such martyr blood. Positive faith only is bold, uncompromising and aggressive; negative faith is cowering, cunning and insinuating. Besides, the premise assumed is refuted by the facts of history. It is not true, that every persecuted sect has flourished, even though it may have embodied a faith to some extent positive. Sects have been checked, abated, and extinguished, by persecution. Witness the extinction of the Donatist sect, in the sixth century, under the strong hand of Gregory the Great; and the fatal blows dealt to the Albigenses by the crusades of Rome. In France, where Protestantism has been most persecuted, Protestantism has made least progress. The history of Protestantism in France is marked with blood. Nowhere did it so often have its dwelling in dungeons; nowhere did it so often give its testimony from the scaffold; nowhere did it bear so marked a resemblance to the christianity of the first ages in faith and love, and in the number of its martyrs; and yet its conquests in France have been meagre. The country of St. Bartholomew's eve, of the atrocities of Charles IX and Louis XIV, is this day in the rear of Protestant advancement.

The fact is, the assertion that any sect will grow under perse-

cution possesses only the shadow of truth. While persecution stimulates and draws forth the resources of any sect, it adds no new elements; and the sect that possesses not the vigor and inherent strength, to rebound under the pressure, must be crushed. The projectile power of a bow is in proportion to its tension, but if too strong an arm siezes it, it must break. Repeated storms cause the oak to root more firmly in the earth, but if a tornado comes, it must be uprooted. The possession of inherent power is pre-requisite, in order to derive benefit from persecution. It was only because christianity possessed such power, carried in its bosom the mighty truth of God, that it survived and grew amid the storms which pressed upon it. The mere stimulant of persecution, galvanizing the lifeless corse of falsehood, were a paltry source from which to evolve the world-moving issues of christianity. On merely human principles, the Church must have been crushed at more than one time in her history but like Israel she survived because the Lord in the midst of her is mighty.

We have thus seen some of the benefits of persecution to the Church. On the other hand it must be admitted, it is attended with many evils, just as sickness is attended with sore temptations. If persecution is a necessary evil, it follows, that it merely furnishes, in smaller evils, a refuge from greater. Times of persecution are generative of the spirit of *fanaticism*. The most insinuating enemy of the martyr, is spiritual pride. He is likely to come to look upon his endurance of persecution as a virtue, and hence to court it by reckless daring. The fanatical spirit has never been entirely absent from the periods of the Church's tribulation. Many in the primitive persecutions eagerly confronted the executors of the law, and courted the embrace of the flames. Fanaticism may exhibit itself in suffering as well as in action. Religion in such times is also in danger of losing its spirit of *gentleness* and *charity*, and becoming stern and bitter, full of invective and denunciation. True such was rarely the character of the expressions which were uttered from the scaffold or the stake; but such was the general character induced upon the Church. It is difficult in the privacy of retirement to preserve a calm and charitable mind, under the goading stings of persecution. The very reaction of the mind, under the pressure of persecution, by which it is made beneficial, must induce a certain degree of pugnacity. Again, persecution is prone to make religion *one-sided*. It becomes a thing of one idea. Its character as a *life*, working out fruitfully in all directions, is subordinated, and it becomes pre-eminently a *power*,

exhibited in the heroic endurance of pain. In the very nature of the case, its force must be spent principally in one direction. Just as continued sickness would prevent the growth and activity of the body, so incessant persecution would ruin the Church. She must have her seasons of calm, healthful, undisturbed growth and development. Whilst the winter may root her more firmly in the earth, the summer must cover her with foliage and fruit.

Chambersburg, Pa.

J. C.

THE SYNERGISTIC LAWS OF SPIRITUAL LIFE IN MAN.

WHEN our Lord cursed the fruitless fig-tree, his disciples doubtless knew that his word was power, and would work some striking effect; but the next morning they marvelled that the fig-tree had withered away. Whereupon he states to them the law of divine and human co-operation in the spiritual kingdom:

“Have faith in God; for verily I say unto you, that whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed and be thou cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart but shall believe that those things which he saith shall come to pass, he shall have whatsoever he saith. Therefore I say unto you, What things soever ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them,” Mark xi: 22ff.

The views of the disciples in accordance with this teaching appear in their exercise of miraculous power after the ascension of Christ, and in their doctrine of the efficacy of believing prayer in general.

For our present purpose it does not concern us to decide whether the Saviour refers to the power of working miracles alone, or to the power of spiritual works in general; for we now take the case simply to illustrate the law of the united agencies of God and man in all the spiritual works of believers, whether miraculous or otherwise.

In the case of the fig-tree, as in every other miracle of Christ, there was an act of divine power at the will of the man Jesus. So the fact appeared to the disciples, and so it really was; for thus alone would the case suggest the law which the Saviour thereupon declared. Now that in miracles, the relation of divine power to the human will was the same in the case of Jesus and in that of the disciples sufficiently appears from the words, He that believeth in me, the works that I do shall he do also; and from the kind of agreement between them and him in the manner of working miracles. And that in the ordinary spiritual acts of Jesus and those of his people, the relation of divine power to the human will may be considered the same in him and in them, is clear from his life being given as their example.

We therefore first inquire into the prevailing relation between divine power and the human will in Jesus Christ.

The reader will see, that our course of thought has no eye whatever to the question of two wills in Christ; but only assumes that whatever of distinctive human will was given in

him bore a uniform and assignable relation to acts of divine power; and it is with that relation only that we now have to do.

On the part of Jesus, the general relation of the will to divine power and authority as personally represented in the Father, was that of implicit and unvarying submission. So prominent was this constitutional trait of the Mediator, even before the *actual* embodiment in the flesh, that it impressed its future form upon the mind of prophecy, and described itself in the obedient declaration, Lo, I come—to do thy will, O God. In the actual incarnation, we hear the same voice of submission continually:—I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight. If it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not my will but thine be done. And this commendation of his submission is carried out by the apostle, who says, that Christ became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. In this submission of Jesus, is found the condition which placed his will in its effective relation to the divine power.

We next observe, that this will of Jesus, in its own sphere, held to the divine power the relation of direction or control. We see him while yet a child, before the doctors in the temple, calling into his service, at his own volition, a superhuman power of knowledge and of utterance, which filled his hearers with astonishment at his understanding and answers. During the forty days temptation in the wilderness, the voluntary fasting was a temporary transfer of his bodily life from the natural supports to the keeping of the divine power, then at his command for that end. He walks on the water, in the exercise of a will, which, at once, originates and guides his bodily motions, and at the same time, either upholds his body without solid support, or makes the water a solid under his feet. In his acts of healing and of resurrection, the divine power waits on his word, which is to command the sick and the lame to rise, and the dead to come forth; or on the motion of his finger, which touches the tongue of the dumb, the ears of the deaf, and the eyes of the blind, as the signal of his will to cure. In the scene of the transfiguration, his body becomes resplendent at his will, and at his will resumes its natural state. When he breathes on his disciples, and says, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, and when he sends them out to work miracles in his name, he gives them, at will, the same power by which he spoke and acted; and in every way, as occasions arise, gives clear proof that his will has such command of divine power, as the will of the natural man has of certain powers of the body and the mind.

There were involuntary effects of the personal agency of Christ, which we notice here as proof that the superhuman forces, in the midst of which he did his voluntary acts, were not all compressed into the narrow sphere of the human will. We call them involuntary, because connected with no manifest, and probably no conscious act of human volition. Of this sort were the motions of the people towards him, so far as they were governed by impressions of his divinity and messiahship. The feeling of the common people who heard him gladly, and glorified God, bore unquestionable marks of what we now call an involuntary divine influence from Christ. A cripple at the pool, who had not been abroad to catch the epidemic fervor, shows indeed no peculiar interest in his presence; but the blind men, who had received upon their religious instincts the impressions of his fame, cry out to him as he passes by, O Lord, thou Son of David, have mercy upon us. A person possessed comes up to him, exclaiming, I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. And evil spirits come out of many, crying out and saying, Thou art Christ, the Son of God. A person in the throng presses timidly towards him to touch the hem of his garment, saying in herself, If I may but touch his garment, I shall be whole. To these and similar mental impressions should be added, effects on the bodies of the sick, in the same sense involuntary. The person who touched his garment drew from him a virtue, which healed her infirmity, without a specific and manifest act of volition from him. In one of the places where the people thronged him with their sick, there went virtue out of him and healed them all. If the forty days fasting, the walking on the water, and other like miracles, should by any reader be excluded from the class of divine works done at the manifest instance of the human will, they would fall in here.

The voluntary miracles illustrate the free command of the human will in Jesus, over phenomena which rest solely on divine power as their efficient cause; the involuntary show that this human will, in its free command over these acts of divine power, is itself immersed continually in an atmosphere of supernatural energy.

The metaphysical explanation of these phenomena is, with man, impossible. The theological explanation is this: "Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me he doeth the works. Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me; or else believe me for the very work's sake." "I can of mine own self

do nothing." "I by the Spirit of God cast out devils." "Thou, Father art in me, and I in thee." In other words, the eternal Son is made flesh in the man Jesus; and the Father in his supremacy, and the Spirit in his energy, are inseparable from the Son. Both still dwell in him. And out of this union of God and man in Christ, arises what we have above stated as the synergistic law of the divine and human operation in Christ. By this law the human will takes conditional command of divine power, and controls an efficient agency in works which lie wholly beyond the sphere of mere humanity. At the same time is this will itself subjected continually to the sway of that supernatural energy, with whose motions it thus freely joins its own acts.

In Christ, the second Adam, humanity re-appears in that union with God which had been lost in the first. In him we look for the example of true spiritual life, both as to its inward constitution and its outward form. In him the life is given in its principle as purely divine, and not an extract or an accident of fallen humanity, in the laws of its action in man, and in the form of its exercises and its fruits.

We next consider the corresponding acts of the disciples, as indicating the relation of the human will to divine power in them.

And on their part again appears the preliminary submission, which we observed in Jesus. They forsake all to follow him, they receive his teachings with the uniform deference of sincere disciples; they go and come at his bidding; they take his word as security for success in their unprecedented mission; they confess his name as the source and the signal of their power. Their unqualified submission proved its depth and sincerity in their devotion first to his person during his visible presence with them, then to his work after his ascension. Its crowning manifestation was their steadfast adherence to him, after his departure, as the God of their trust and their worship.

The exception of an individual among them, to whom a part of this description will not apply, is connected with a corresponding exception as to his work. The partial submission, which went only to the outward sphere of the physical miracle, and stopped short of the intimate sphere of the ethical, was still a steadfast submission to the faith in the miracle working power, and thus a qualification *quo ad hoc*.

In this condition of submission, the will of the disciples like that of Jesus, held to the divine the relation of direction and control. In all respects relating to our present view, the disci-

ples proceeded, in miracles, exactly in the manner of Jesus. There was no more appearance of waiting for spiritual motions in them, than in him ; no more sign of a conscious inability to command the divine power at their pleasure. Peter, with the cripple at the gate of the temple, speaks of the power of healing as something which he had to give ; as one might have silver and gold. The miracles of healing the sick and raising the dead were wrought, whenever the apostles, at their own option, called the divine energy into action. When their occasions require, they detect falsehood and imposture by virtue of a superhuman penetration. Ananias and Sapphira are struck dead, and Elymas, the sorcerer, is struck blind, at their word. In the inspiration by which the apostles and the christian prophets had a supernatural apprehension of spiritual things, they exercised an optional command of such discernment as their occasions called for ; perceiving, as by elective will, or the natural laws of suggestion, such appropriate items of divine knowledge as made their words always in season. The gift of supernatural discernment and speech by the Holy Spirit was conferred and withheld at the pleasure of the apostles ; while the grand fact which presents our point in firm proof and clear light, is the possession of spiritual gifts in such diversity and profusion by the christians ; —all to be regulated in their use, by the sense of order and propriety among the brethren, and under the declared law that “the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.”

At the same time this voluntary command of divine power was comprehended, as in the case of Jesus, in an atmosphere of supernatural energy, diffused through the sphere of the human presence, without particular control by the volitions of the men. Thus handkerchiefs or aprons were brought from the body of Paul to the sick, “and the diseases departed from them and the evil spirits went out of them.” A soothsaying damsel at Philippi followed the disciples many days exclaiming, These men are the servants of the most high God, which show unto us the way of salvation. The Lord opened the heart of one, softened the temper of another, and conciliated the respectful attentions and liberal kindness of others, who fell under the personal influence of the apostle Paul. In the prison at Philippi, the doors of the prison are opened at midnight, and the prisoners are unbound, and no prisoner attempts to escape. All that spiritual influence which attended the preaching of the apostles, and their miracles, and their intercourse with the people, and which caused the word of God “so mightily to grow and prevail,” belongs to the class of involuntary effects of the personal presence and activity of the disciples as agents in dispensing heavenly power.

The voluntary miracles of the apostles, like those of Jesus, prove a free command of the human will in them over operations of divine power; the involuntary show that this human will, in its free command over these divine motions, is itself comprehended in an atmosphere of supernatural energy.

Of these phenomena, as of those of Jesus, we have no metaphysical explanation. Their theological conditions are these: "Lo, I am with you always" "I in them, and thou in me." "As thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." "If a man love me, my Father will love him, and we will come and make our abode with him." "Know ye not of your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?" "The glory which thou gavest me I have given unto them." "He that believeth in me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do, because I go to my Father."

These words signify *first*, that God with his power over all things was in those disciples as he is in Christ, and submitted his power conditionally to their will, as he submitted his power to the human will in Jesus. He so surrenders himself to the conditions of humanity in them as to allow his own personal and peculiar energy to obey their volitions, as it obeyed the human volitions of Jesus, and as the hand of the natural body obeys the will of the mind.

The words *further* signify, that God, who, in the eternal Son, became immediately united with humanity in the person of Christ, is united mediately through Christ with the persons of his disciples. In him the divine power is joined immediately to personal humanity; in them it becomes a personal constituent through his mediation. The facts in the one case form the decisive example of the immediate union of God and man *in* Christ; the facts in the other case form an equally clear example of the mediated union of God with his people *through* Christ. Now it is the constituted subordination of divine power to the human will which forms to us the intelligible sign of single personality in Christ, and represents to us the reality of the manifestation of God *in* the flesh. Without this we could not understand that the Word was really made flesh. The divine nature having now, in the person of the Son, assumed its connexion with humanity, and revealed the relation which it condescends to hold to the personal agency of man, the way is prepared to extend this relation, through the medium of the person thus formed, to those who shall be heirs of salvation. The way of producing this union of divine power with the people of

God, is by the actual indwelling of Christ in them. Christ is formed in them;—lives in them;—dwells in them; and this is the language in which the scriptures describe the application of divine power in the acts of the spiritual life. “No man cometh to the Father but by me;” says Christ himself; and this doctrine of the mediated presence of God with his people the apostles maintain in their assertions, that through Christ we have access to the Father. Christ joins God and man in himself; then with his complex nature becomes the life of his people; doing in them, and through their free and personal agency, what he did in his separate and personal life as a manifestation of God in the flesh. With God then united to the humanity in Christ, with the divine power in him subjected, under certain conditions and in certain matters, to the human will; and then, with Christ, the first born of every creature, the first formed spiritual man, the principle, the model, the embodied power of the new life of man, so reproduced in his people, so concorporate with them, as to bring forth in them and through them, such works as he first wrought in his separate person without them;—we have the mysterious and adorable constitution of the new creation in Christ. And in this constitution we clearly discern, as an essential and unchangeable feature, an optional control of divine acts by the human will;—natural freedom in the use of supernatural power.

This natural freedom in the use of supernatural power we witness in the miraculous works of Christ, and in the similar works of his disciples, which originated from his presence and power in them. We may distinguish these miraculous works as physical phenomena of the spiritual life. They are more striking than the ethical,⁴ because impressions from the supernatural changes of sensible things receive powerful aid through the senses. We more readily perceive in them the difference between the natural and the supernatural. Of the ethical phenomena of human nature, we distinguish with more difficulty those which are spiritual from those which are merely natural. But knowing from the scriptures that all holy acts and affections in man are effects of divine power, and that these holy acts and affections are required by authority and rewarded as virtue, we trace the same relation of divine power to the human will in the common works of the christian life as in the miracles of Christ and the apostles.

⁴ The term ethical is here used to distinguish only the effects of the volition; with no reference whatever to the quality of the volition itself.

Of this relation of divine power to the ethical volitions of human nature, the invariable prerequisite is that same submission which was given as the condition of divine co-operation in miracles. "If ye abide in me and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will and it shall be done unto you." "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love." "Have faith in God." The faith required in the last of these directions is the submission and obedience supposed in the other two. It is the disposition to say, I come to do thy will; My meat is to do the will of God; Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? It is the consent of the soul to the divine requirements; acquiescence in the motions of the Spirit, already given as signs of the divine will, and as impulsive guides for the will of the man. The whole complex of this mental state is expressed by the term faith, because in this consent or acquiescence, the leading exercise of the mind is that faith which holds a lively and steady apprehension of God as the fountain of power for human redemption, and the head of authority for human obedience.

Of the origin of this faith we have decisive instruction. It is God that deals to every man the measure of faith; and he is said to give to one, by the Spirit, the word of wisdom, to another faith by the same Spirit. The faith originates in the divine power. It is a fruit of the Spirit. And the supernatural power in the support and increase of this faith is so subordinated to the voluntary motions of the soul, that the exercise of the faith itself, like all its ethical concomitants which are to be sought by self-direction and discipline, is enjoined by authority and maintained by conscious endeavor for that end.

The beginning of faith arises out of the act of Christ, by which he begins his residence and the operation of the Spirit in the soul. By this the voluntary exercises are brought at once into such an agreement with the presence of Christ and the motions of his Spirit, that the instant determination of the mind is towards the act of faith. And thenceforward, the will continues its submission to the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus now reigning within, while at the same time it occasions, by its own determination, such acts of divine power as result in the other appropriate phenomena of the spiritual life.

The husbandman learns from his own experience or that of others, the properties of his soil and the laws of its production, and also the nature of his seed, and the laws of its vegetation. He begins his agriculture by submission to the laws he has thus ascertained, making them his guide in tillage, and in fixing the

time and manner of sowing his seed, and by his voluntary agency, always maintained in this posture of submission, he directs the operation of natural powers without which his agriculture could do nothing. The spiritual man comes under the law of his proper life by the indwelling of Christ, and the work of his Spirit, and this submission to the law of life in Christ is faith. It is acquired, not as the faith of the husbandman, by experience or observation, but by the work of the Spirit of Christ who dwells in him. In this state of submission to the laws of life in Christ, he directs by his voluntary agency the acts of a supernatural power, without which he could do nothing.

All things are now ready for the process of spiritual culture by divine power, under the conduct of the human will. The spiritual man is not sufficient to do any thing of himself, but with the sufficiency of God, he can do all things. For all true knowledge he is dependent on the Holy Spirit; and yet by the study of the word of God, by the devout exercise of his thoughts upon the heavenly mysteries, by prayer, by all the natural helps of mental activity amidst the doctrines of Christ, he can increase his knowledge at pleasure. All true christian love is a fruit of the Spirit, and is so in the strictest sense; yet by guarding, in obedience to the laws of our moral nature, against vicious influence, and by the habitual and active contemplation of the things which are pure, honest, lovely and of good report, the believer accomplishes a voluntary growth in the spiritual grace of love. The discipline of our salvation is carried on by this submission of divine power to the conditional command of the personal will in man; and thus, with fear and trembling, that is, with that reverential and submissive sense of the divine presence and power, which is the true form of faith, we work out our own salvation, while it is God that worketh in us to will and to do of his good pleasure.

In this view of the divine and human agencies united in the spiritual life of man, the questions relating to divine sovereignty and human freedom, are resolved into questions of fact to be settled by history. From the earthly history of our Lord, and the miracles of his apostles, the settled facts are these: First, the submission of the human will to the divine in the acts of faith, then, the command of the human will over divine power in the acts of freedom. The freedom is seen in both the submission and the command. Matthew was called from the receipt of custom to follow Christ, and obeyed. The young ruler was required to sell his estates and to follow Christ, and did not obey. Now, while no one can deny, that the divine impulse which pre-

disposed the will of Matthew to obedience, whether that impulse was conveyed through a long course of antecedent events in the history of the man, or by an instantaneous act, was directed by sovereignty, it is also undeniable that the compliance of Matthew and the non-compliance of the ruler were alike voluntary. When Matthew has yielded to the guidance of faith, and is prepared to receive from Jesus the promise of miraculous power and to rest implicitly upon it, he takes command of the power of miracles, and he finds that power at his disposal, as occasions arise, whenever he complies with the conditions.

The submission and the command are thus historically established in relation to miracles. Then, having established this relation of the divine and human agencies to one another in working miracles, it will be, in the common views of christian people, an argument from the greater to the less, to conclude that the law which thus holds in miracles prevails in the ordinary acts of the spiritual life. Add to this the doctrines taught by the apostles and the precepts enjoined by them, which show that in their judgment the whole work of christian discipline depends on this law, and the mutual relation of the divine and human agencies in this course of discipline becomes fully established.

The train of thought above presented begins with our Lord Jesus Christ,—the original and model of dependence and freedom in the spiritual life of humanity,—and follows that constitution of the new creature in its propagation in the church. If it offers any facility in clearing, and consequently reconciling, the views of Christians concerning dependence and freedom, and in maintaining the consistency and truth of the Calvinistic exhibition of this subject, it will commend itself to the reader as one theological argument among many in which illustration serves for proof.

N. M. S.

THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

WE find in the last number of the Princeton Repertory a long article on Ursinus and the Heidelberg Catechism, (attributed to the pen of the Rev. Dr. Proudfit of New Brunswick,) in which we are called to account, not in the sweetest tone imaginable, for our article on the distinguished author of this formulary, which appears as an Introduction to Williard's translation of his Commentary on the Catechism, and which was published also in a late number of the Mercersburg Review. To make out a more full and ample case, reference is had also to our small volume, published some years since, under the title of the "History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism," as well as to the first and second of our recent articles on "Early Christianity."

First comes the unfortunate tail of the 80th question; a point, hardly entitled, in our opinion, to half a dozen pages of grave discussion in an ostensibly scientific review, and of which in the end just nothing at all is made for the reviewer's main purpose. The only show of advantage he may seem to have against us, (and it is but a thin show at best,) is found in some slight discrepancy there is, between our statement of the matter in 1847 and the representation we have made of it in 1851; this too concerning a single doubtful historical particular merely, and not changing the substance of the principal fact. In 1851 we say, of the tail of the 80th question, that it formed no part of the original Catechism as published under the hand of Ursinus himself; that it is wanting in the first two editions; and that it "was afterwards foisted in, only by the authority of the Elector Frederick, in the way of angry retort and counterblast, we are told, for certain severe declarations the other way, which had been passed a short time before by the Council of Trent." Dr. Proudfit has no historical authority to urge in opposition to this statement. But on turning to our own book published in 1847, he finds the same statement in relation to the tail of the question, namely that it did not appear before the third edition, but along with this an intimation that the whole question was wanting in the first edition; while it is added, that the Elector took pains afterwards, in view of the decrees passed by the Council of Trent, "to have the question restored in full to *the form in which it was originally composed*," allowing the previous text to go out of use as "*defective and incorrect*." That this representation differs some from the other, is at once evident enough. The reviewer allows, that it may be accounted for by a change

of view in regard to what was the actual state of the case, between the dates of the two statements; but goes on immediately to say, that the *progress* from the statement of 1847 to that of 1851 has been in the direction of error and not of truth; mumbling something about our having failed to explain the variation in the later version, and with no small indelicacy insinuating a charge of direct dishonesty in the whole business. The man who talks in this way, may well be held somewhat sternly to the strict proof of what he says. "We shall convince the reader," writes Dr. Proudfit, "that his progress in this respect, (we fear in others too,) has been in the direction of error and not of truth." This means, if it mean anything at all, that the light in which the point in hand is presented by us in 1847, is nearer the truth than the view taken of it in 1851. But now what is the evidence brought to uphold this assertion? We have looked for it with some interest; and at first expected indeed, (from the confident tone of the critic,) that our own former impression was about to be justified again by some proof, better than any we had been able to find for it when writing our later sketch. But we are constrained to say, that we have been altogether disappointed. Not a word is quoted from any authority, which is of any real force, to show that the 80th question "was contained in the original draft as written by Ursinus," or that the third edition restored here simply what had been omitted in the first and second. The only show of evidence for any such supposition, (beyond our own mistaken statement in 1847,) is found in a single word of the notice to the Christian Reader appended, as Niemeyer says, to both the second and third editions: "*Was im ersten truck übersehen wird, als fürnemlich folio 55, ist jetzunder auss befelch Churfürstlicher Gnaden addiert worden.*"¹ The proof is made to lie in the word "*übersehen*," which Dr. Proudfit chooses to translate in the sense of "*omitted*." This implies, that it belonged to the first draft. "Can anything be said to be *omitted* in the printing," asks our censor triumphantly, "which was not *contained* in the manuscript copy? This very inscription substantiates, beyond a doubt, the statement of Dr. N. (1847), that in the third edition it was *restored* to the form in which it was originally composed. What shall we say then of Dr. N's. charge, in contradiction to all history, &c.—? We have no disposition to find a

¹ What was *overlooked* in the first edition, as especially fol. 55, has now been added by order of his Electoral Grace, 1563.

name for it." All this proof, however, is mere smoke. The first sense of the word "übersehen," as Dr. P. himself very well knows, is "overlooked." To overlook *may* signify to omit; an oversight is an omission; but no such term would be used to express a deliberate suppression, like that which is imagined in the case now before us. Had the addition thus accounted for been in truth part of the text as it first stood, the fact would have been stated in plain terms. Besides, the note was appended to the second edition as well as to the third; which however gave this question differently. The second then, according to this view, pretended to make good the *overseen* omission of copy in the first, but overlooked also itself the last clause, making room thus for still farther correction in the third. But again, the note refers to this novelty as one only, though the main one (*fürnemlich folio 55,*) among several alterations found in this third edition; for as Van Alpen informs us, "the first edition was in many things different from those that followed." These other differences seem not indeed to have touched the substance of the text, but to have been confined to the form in which it was printed, the division into sabbaths, and the citations of scriptural proof. But the word "übersehen" extends to them all; and if Dr. Proudfit's exegesis is good, it must follow that the whole of these later emendations belonged in truth to the original copy as drawn up by Ursinus, and had been omitted by oversight when it was first printed—a tough hypothesis, which even the Brunswick Professor himself, we presume, will hardly care to swallow. Altogether it is clear, that "übersehen" here is *not* to be forced into the meaning of "omitted;" but that it is to be taken in its proper secondary sense of "missed" or as we say, "wanting;" and simply informs the reader, that the additions, or new things, found in the 2nd and 3rd editions as compared with the first were brought in to complete the Catechism by order of his Grace the Elector, who was the head at once of both Church and State, so far as the Palatinate was then concerned. This implies, that the want of the 80th question in the first edition, as well as the other matters now corrected, might be considered a defect or oversight, a sort of chasm in the text that needed to be filled in order that it might be properly complete; but it implies nothing beyond this, and instead of substantiating the point for which it is urged by Dr. Proudfit, goes very decidedly, we think, to substantiate precisely the contrary.

Dr. Proudfit's conjectural construction, then, to explain the "gradual insertion of the 80th question," falls to the ground with the airy bottom on which it is made to rest. It is at best

not very honorable to Frederick and his theologians. Their zeal for truth gave birth in the first place to this question just as it now stands; but when ready, it was held most politic to keep it back, fear prevailing over faith in the Elector's mind. Gradually, however, the pious prince mustered courage to bring it out; first, all but the tail; and then the whole figure, tail and all; cunningly accounting for its tardy appearance, at the same time, by the transparent lie that it had been "overlooked" in the first edition, left out by accident rather than design. A pretty exemplification truly of Frederick's piety and good sense. Happily for his memory, however, the apology regards a case which is as purely hypothetical as itself. The entire "*fact*," of which it pretends to be the historical construction, resolves itself, as we have said before, into sheer smoke.

Still, the blunder itself is one towards which *we* at least are bound to exercise some indulgence; for it is one, into which our own book of 1847 somehow fell, as we have already seen; and our "precarious" example in the case, we are much inclined to suspect, has gone farther than any other appearance of authority to throw our brother of New Brunswick out of the right track. We certainly had some ground before us in 1847, which seemed at the time to justify the shape into which our statement was thrown in writing the "*History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism*," but what it was exactly, we are now wholly at a loss to say; perhaps some expression in Van Alpen, whose work we have not had latterly within reach; most probably however, in any case, just some such misconstrued phrase or word, as we have now had under consideration from the note preserved by Niemeyer. At all events, when we came to speak of the point again in 1851, we found it impossible to verify what we said before of the original manuscript text. On the contrary, our authorities were plainly against it. Witnesses of the most respectable order, not before at hand, convinced us that our former statement was without proper foundation; a conclusion, which we saw to be required also by the inward evidence of the whole case. So we quietly receded from our earlier representation, making our statement in 1851 conformable to what we then believed, and now believe, to be the simple truth of history. The statement is given purposely in the most general terms. It does not say, that the 80th question was wanting altogether in the first edition; for the authorities are ambiguous as to that point also, (Niemeyer has it, following Van Alpen, "*vel prorsus omisa vel mutilata*"); and it decides not how or whence the question came, when finally introduced into the text. The state-

ment looks only to the tail of the thing. That, at any rate, belonged neither to the first nor second edition. The harsh anathema formed no part of the original work, "as published under the hand of Ursinus himself;" even had it been in the manuscript draft, this would remain true; it was not *published* under his hand; his judgment, in that case, must be regarded as having gone against its publication. So much latitude our statement was purposely framed to include. But the latitude need not have been put so wide. The supposition of any such keeping back of the 80th question, and more especially the anathema which forms the tail of it, is purely gratuitous, and rests so far as we are able to see on no proof whatever.

But why was there no retraction then in 1851 of what had been said four years before in 1847, no explanation of the discrepancy between the earlier statement and the last? Dr. P. affects to find this very suspicious. But we beg leave to say, that it would have savored of pedantry, to go out of our way, in such an article as our Introduction to Williard's Ursinus, to clear up a circumstantial point of this sort, to show how we had been led to take a different view of the circumstance in question at different times. The object of our last article required no such digression; it was enough to state in general terms the historical fact, as it appeared to us at the time. What historian does not find occasion, in successive editions even of the same work, (if he be not himself a scientific automaton,) to correct himself in many more serious respects? But what historian is bound, in every instance of doing so, to parade an officious explanation of the acknowledged discrepancy? The case calls for no such anxious and tedious pedantry.

We have said, that the circumstance thus brought into small dispute is of no conclusive account, at any rate, for the reviewer's main object. Had the 80th question been prepared in full before the issue of the first edition of the Catechism, (whether from the pen of Ursinus or from that of Olevianus,) it would be still certain that it was deliberately stricken out, so far as it failed to appear in the *original publication*, and that the concluding anathema at least, "so foreign from the reigning spirit of Melancthon and Ursinus," formed no part of this publication, but was "wanting in the first two editions" altogether. The case, however, is made stronger, when we know that the later addition was no such originally rejected article or clause; and under this view it is that we now boldly appeal to it as abundantly bearing us out in all that we have said. It is a simple matter of historical fact, that the last clause of the 80th question formed

no part of the Catechism as first published ; that it was wanting in the second edition as well as the first ; and that it " was afterwards foisted in only by the authority of the Elector Frederick, in the way of angry retort and counterblast," over against certain corresponding fulminations of the Council of Trent.

We have lately furnished a series of historical authorities and quotations in proof of this general fact, in reply to the challenge of some unknown minister of the Reformed Dutch Church, through the columns of the Christian Intelligencer. It is not necessary to repeat them in this place. Their weight is not impaired in the least by anything in Dr. Proudfit's article. Rather we may say, he himself grants in truth the whole fact, which he makes a show of calling in question ; only trying to break the force of it, as we have seen, by foisting in (*pax verbo*) a perfectly untenable hypothesis for its explanation. The case is one, indeed, which allows of no dispute, and in reference to which we never dreamed of being called upon to make any defence. All writers on the Catechism agree, that the last clause of the 80th question did not belong to it as originally published, but was added to the third edition "*aus Churfürstlicher Gnaden.*"

But granting this, as he has to do, our Brunswick critic still labors to make out his charge of historical falsification, by raising small issues in his own way, for which there is no real ground in anything we have actually said, just for the purpose, as it might seem, of diverting attention from the only question that is really in debate. Thus the word "foist," he tells us, must mean "to insert by *forgery*," because it is so defined by Dr. Johnston ;¹ as if every man of common education did not know, that the reigning *usus loquendi* of this country at least allows it a much wider signification. We never thought of *forgery*, in applying it to the Elector Frederick. Webster defines it, "to insert surreptitiously, wrongfully, or without warrant." This the good old Elector did. When the Catechism was first ready for publication, it was submitted to a synod of the superintendents and leading pastors of the Palatinate for examination and review ; and thus approved, it came out under the sanction

¹ Hereupon the Professor grows tragic, with solemn mien, and deep sepulchral tone, delivering himself as follows : "Have then the Reformed Churches been teaching, preaching and expounding for nearly three centuries, a *forgery*, under the belief that it was a truth of God ? Such is the heavy charge brought against them by Dr. Nevin. Blessed be God, there is no truth in it"—A very affecting stroke of rhetoric certainly.

of proper ecclesiastical authority, as well as by order of the civil power. It was the work, not simply of Ursinus nor of Frederick, but of the Church. But the addition now before us was not in that first text. It was introduced afterwards, without any action of the church, by the sole authority of the temporal prince. That he had full political right to do this, under the Erastian order of the Palatinate, we are perfectly well aware. But had he any true church right to exercise such power? We believe not. It is not for any secular prince, to make articles of faith for the church within his realm, however pious may be his intentions. Frederick then acted without proper religious warrant, when he undertook to mend the Catechism from his own will. The liberty may have been sanctioned, by the subsequent acquiescence of the church. But still in itself it was arbitrary, temerarious, and wrong; and this is just what we meant to imply, when we applied to his conduct the disparaging word now under consideration. The malediction of the 80th question *was* "foisted" into the Catechism, after its first formal publication, by the sole authority of the Elector Frederick.

But now, according to Dr. Proudfit, this can bear but three interpretations, namely, "that the clause in question was inserted after the death of Ursinus, without his knowledge, or against his consent and convictions." We say, it calls not necessarily for any of these suppositions. Certainly Ursinus, who outlived Frederick, knew of this addition made to the Catechism before it was a year old, acquiesced in it with the rest of the church, and considered it doctrinally correct. But it does not follow from this, that it was not brought in without warrant by the Elector, or that the judgment of Ursinus went in favor of the supposed improvement. He might consider the clause theologically sound, and yet not wish to see it in the Catechism. Or, even if we suppose him fully reconciled to the thing, when it took place, the general nature of the fact, as we have stated it, remains the same. It is still certain, at all events, that the clause was not from the will of Ursinus, as this appears in the first publication of the Catechism; and also, that it was added afterwards, however publicly, on the sole responsibility of the Elector.

The following passage, quoted before on the point here in consideration as a note to our article in its Review form, (not seen probably, or at least not heeded, by our present critic,) it may be worth while here to quote again:

"Frederick by no means followed passively and blindly the counsel of his theologians; but the Reformed doctrine, and along

with it the most determined dislike towards the Roman worship, and towards all that was still retained from it in the Lutheran church, were for him a matter of strong inward and personal religious conviction, which he well knew himself how to uphold and defend from his own diligent and careful study of the Scriptures. From these, particularly from the *Old Testament*, he deduced his duty to tolerate no idolatry in his land, though it should be in never so mild and plausible a form. Hence in the *second* and *third* editions of the Heidelberg Catechism, the 80th question, by his positive order alone, and *against* the counsel and will of its authors, was made to receive the addition, then highly offensive and dangerous, 'So that the mass, at bottom, is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry;' and he obstinately refused afterwards to give up the clause, in spite of all intimidations from the emperor and the empire set before him for the purpose."—*Goebel, Churches of the Rhine, p. 365.*

This writer, it will be seen, does not hesitate to say that the addition to the 80th question was brought in *against* the counsel and will positively of Ursinus and Olevianus. Our language has been much more reserved and guarded. We have said merely that it was wanting in the Catechism as they first gave it to the world, and that it was foisted in afterwards by another will.

So says *Seisen* also, in his late *Denkschrift* (p. 204.) devoted specially to the History of the Reformation in Heidelberg. *Vierordt*, in his History of the Reformation in Baden, (p. 466,) has the same testimony. So the article on the Heidelberg Catechism in the Encyclopedia of *Ersch* and *Gruber*; so *Niemeyer*, as we have just seen (p. 57, 58); so *Böckel* (p. 398); and so *Henry Alling*, in his *Hist. Eccl. Pal.* (c. 44), who says the addition was made "ex speciali Electoris mandato."¹

Dr. Proudfit takes pains, in his characteristic style, to show that Melancthon and Ursinus had a bad opinion of the mass, as well as of Romanism generally, and that it is *therefore* false to say that the anathema of the Catechism was "foreign from their spirit." This is small criticism, and when all is done a mere quibble. We know very well, that all the Reformers

¹ *Ebrard*, in his work on the Lord's Supper (Vol. II. p. 609), also takes occasion to tell his readers, that "the last clause of the celebrated 80th question is *not original*, but was added first in the *third* edition, *most arbitrarily* (höchst eigenhändig), by the Elector." language quite as strong, we think, as the "*foisted in*" of our own article.

were enemies to the church of Rome and denounced the Roman mass. But what then? Will it follow, that all of them were alike prepared and disposed to insert this sweeping clause of the 80th question, in a standing church symbol? Or supposing even they were so, through stress of controversial zeal, might not this itself be still, for some of them at least, a thing foreign from their own reigning spirit? Luther could be violent enough against the mass, when it suited; but for all this, we know very well that *his* spirit here was not the same with that of Zuingli; as altogether the *animus* of Lutheranism, we may say, was materially different from that of the Reformed confession. So Melancthon may say very hard things of Romanism; but it is gross wrong to argue from this, that he was not any more mild and irenic in his spirit than Luther and the other Reformers generally. We know that he was. His character is, in this respect, well settled in history, and not to be overthrown by any special pleading or quibbling, in Dr. Proudfit's peculiar vein. It is notorious too, that Ursinus, with all his constitutional earnestness, partook largely of the same quiet and pacific spirit. Dr. P. indeed allows himself to question his title to the praise we have bestowed upon him on this score; but with no good reason that we can see, in the face of our own remark, that "it is characteristic of such a soft and quiet nature to be at the same time ardent, and excitable on occasions even to passion." Then again, the reigning spirit of the Heidelberg Catechism is not a point that can be said to be now open for contradiction or debate. No one questions its decidedly Protestant character, its general opposition to the church of Rome, its Reformed or Calvinistic complexion as distinguished from high Lutheranism. But with all this, its predominant character is truly like that of Melancthon himself, full of moderation and peace, rich in gentleness and love throughout. Altogether then, we had a perfect right to characterise the harsh anathema attached to the 80th question, as "foreign from the spirit of Melancthon and Ursinus, and from the *reigning* tone also of the Heidelberg Catechism." It is not in fair keeping with the proper ecclesiastical genius of these great men; and it forms a marked exception to the method and manner of the Catechism, to its general bearing, as it comes before us at all other points.

Another specimen of our critic's special pleading, equally sophistical and unfair, is presented to us in the way he deals with certain leading features attributed by our article to the Heidelberg Catechism, particularly its *mystical* element and its sympathy with the old *catholic* life of the church. His remarks on

“mysticism,” which he takes as of one sense simply with “mystery,” and as the exclusion of intelligibility, are sufficiently illogical, not to say ridiculously absurd. And it is if possible still more absurd, to deny what we have said of the “catholic” spirit of the Catechism, by just assuming at once that this must mean sympathy with the distinguishing features of Romanism at the time of the Reformation, and then going on gravely to show that the formulary is plainly antagonistic to this system, on all proper Protestant points. As if any one in his senses could ever think otherwise of a *Reformed* symbol! This however is the very “art and mystery,” on which the reviewer mainly relies, for giving effect to his whole attack. He sees in all a covert league with Romanism, a design even to Romanize the Reformed church, by making it appear that the Heidelberg Catechism is after all more Roman than Protestant. To such end looks and runs the word “catholic;” and this again is the key to the changes rung on that other word “mystical.” It is all to seduce Protestants into the arms of the “Great Harlot.” But Dr. Proudfit can see through the mill-stone of this awful “gun-powder plot,” and he will set the world right. If it be too late to save the German Reformed church from being swallowed up alive by the horrible snare, (without knowing it,) *he* will see to it at least that the Reformed Dutch church, and all other branches of the Reformed church, be properly warned and kept out of harm’s way. So we have the cry, *Romanism! Romanism!* lustily shouted for effect. That is always sure, in such a case, to carry the popular ear. For the popular mind too, it is able to cover a multitude of sins, offences we mean against logic as well as charity and truth. “But is it really so?” asks the fanatical jealousy thus roused, rubbing its owlish eyes, and peering into the dark inane.—“Certainly,” our alarmist replies, “you may see it in this picture of the Catechism and Ursinus, as plain as the nose on your own face.”—“Where? Do in pity tell.”—“Why *there*, in what is said of the catholic and mystical spirit of the work. Do not these terms point straight towards Rome? Is she not ‘MYSTERY,’ by apocalyptic seal? And is not she also the ‘*Catholic*’ church? But the Catechism has always been praised for its simplicity and perspicuity. It is notoriously at war moreover with Romanism; else why should it have been so fiercely assaulted by the Papists, when it first appeared? Does Rome not know her own friends? *Ergo*, this picture of the Heidelberg Catechism, both as given in 1847 and now as we have it here again in 1851, we are bound to consider insidious and false.”—So runs the argument; lame enough in

all conscience; made up of *ad captandum* clap-trap mainly; but for this very reason also, we may add, but too sure of its own currency with the popular prejudice to which it makes its appeal.

All this however does not disturb in the least the truth of our picture, taken in its own fair and proper sense. The Catechism remains still truly *Melancthonian* in its constitution; and carries in it accordingly both a catholic spirit and a rich mystical vein, beyond all that is to be found of this sort in any other symbolical book of the Reformed confession.

It breathes, we say, a *catholic* spirit. This does not mean, that it is either Roman or Lutheran in its theological mind; we know that it is neither; we speak of it always as a Reformed symbol, and judge it from the standpoint and standard of its own class. The Reformed confession includes various types of thought, receding more or less from Lutheranism and Catholicism in the Roman form. Modern Puritanism forms the extreme left of this prismatic spectrum, the greatest possible refraction, where the light of Christianity shades off finally, through the faint violet of Baptist Independentism, into clear Unitarian negation. The Heidelberg Catechism, on the other hand, represents just the other side of the Reformed scheme, that namely by which it lies next to the original Lutheran confession, and so in felt organic connection also with the past life of the church in its universal character. This grew in some measure necessarily out of the circumstances of its formation; the fact was felt and acknowledged, when the symbol first made its appearance; and the evidence of it is still open to all, in the work itself. It has found more favor even in the Lutheran church, than any other symbol belonging to the Reformed interest; and for this latter interest itself, as we all know, it was exalted at once to a sort of ecumenical authority; a fact, of itself sufficient to attest its catholic character. This character here, however, implies more than mere liberality. Unitarianism is liberal; all indifferentism, all negative rationalism, is liberal in its own way; carries in itself just because it is negative, no positive contents for faith and life. Catholicity, on the contrary, supposes faith, truth, concrete reality, a given substance in the form of religion, a divine historical fact to be submitted to by all men, and found to be commensurate with the universal wants of the world. Such is the old force of the term, as employed to express a characteristic attribute of the church from the beginning. So understood, it carries in it necessarily the idea of sympathy and correspondence with the old life of Christianity, as this has formed the historical identity of the church through all ages, before the

Reformation as well as since; for surely this life must have comprehended in it the true and proper substance of Christianity all along, (however overlaid with corruptions and errors,) from which to be disunited, must be held to be one and the same thing with ecclesiastical death. The catholicity of the Heidelberg Catechism then involves certainly, as it ought to do, "sympathy with the religious life of the old Catholic Church." In this trait, it goes beyond all other Reformed symbols; though it is in contrast with the later forms of Puritanism mainly, that its significance comes fully into view. The Reformed faith generally in the beginning, though not just of one type here, owned the necessity of such fellowship in spirit with the historical substance of Catholicism as it had come down from other ages; and for this very reason fell in easily with the catholic soul and voice of the Heidelberg Catechism. But no such mind belongs to modern Puritanism. This has almost no sympathy whatever with the old church faith. All really churchly and catholic ideas, are for it a perfect abomination. It disowns the sacraments in their ancient sense, and scouts the obligation of the creed. In contradistinction to this system, that now affects to be not only the whole sense of the Reformed confession, (which notoriously it is not,) but the whole sense also of whole Protestantism, (which is a still greater falsehood,) we have characterised the Catechism as being in its reigning spirit historical and catholic. It is not Puritan. Modern Puritanism could not use it with hearty freedom and good-will; and those who try to bend it to this standard, are always guilty of doing it gross violence and wrong. Its veneration for the creed, its doctrine of the holy sacraments, at once place it in a different order of religious faith. It does not go on the assumption, that the truths of Christianity may be put together in any and every way to suit the private judgment of modern times;¹ but holds the form and order of the creed to be the necessary type, and indispensable condition,

¹ "Protestantism takes the doctrines of the Bible into its creed, in just such an order as it thinks *to be natural*. But the other system holds itself bound to the order of the Apostles' Creed." Thus speaks the Puritan Recorder, in its caricature not long since of our second article on Early Christianity; not aware seemingly of the abyss of rationalism, which such a confession involves. For "Protestantism" however in this case, we should read "Puritanism." This last does indeed pretend to reconstruct Christianity from the bottom, putting its parts together as to itself seems natural; but original Protestantism was guilty of no such presumption. It felt itself bound to follow the Apostles' Creed, and the decisions of the first general councils.

of all sound doctrine; a true *regula fidei*, the force of which must extend with real plastic power to every other article of evangelical belief to make it really orthodox and right. "No Protestant doctrine can ever be held in a safe form, which is not so held as to be in truth a living branch from the trunk of this primitive symbol, in the consciousness of faith."*

The Catechism, we say again, makes room largely for the *mystical* interest in religion, as well as for that which is merely logical and intellectual. We doubt whether Dr. Proudfit has the idea at all which this term is employed to express, by such writers for instance as Neander or Ullmann, when applied to the subject of the religious life under the opposition now stated; for it is not easy to understand otherwise, how it could be so grossly caricatured as we find it to be in his hands. The Catechism is not made up of riddles certainly, transcendentalisms or far fetched Delphic oracles. Its "*mystik*" is not mystification, mysticism in the bad sense. But what then? We may say the same thing, with just as much force, of the Bible. Is there then no mystical element here? Are its propositions of so much force only, in general, as may be felt through the medium of the logical understanding? The Old Testament is throughout mystical, the letter symbolizing the spirit, the face of Moses covered

* Dr. Proudfit puts on a show of surprise over the following declaration, found in one of our late articles: "However much of rubbish the Reformation found occasion to remove, it was still compelled to do homage to the main body of the Roman theology as orthodox and right; and to this day Protestantism has no valid mission in the world, any farther than it is willing to build on this old foundation." If he can really think that the truth of this statement is set aside by a couple of exclamation points, we have only to say that we pity his theological and historical knowledge. Let any one take the trouble merely to read the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas, or even the Catechism only of the Council of Trent, and if he have a spark of ingenuous feeling in him, he will be heartily ashamed of the ignorance and prejudice that too commonly reign among Protestants with regard to this point. The great body of our divinity, God be praised, is not of yesterday, but has come down to us as a rich legacy from former times, *through the Roman Catholic church*. The same may be said of the ethical wealth, which is embodied in our modern civilization. How much of all, pray, do we owe to the Waldenses, Albigenses, and Paulicians? Take away the old Catholic trunk, and there can be no worth nor life in any Protestant doctrine. The mission of Protestantism most certainly, if it be from heaven and not as its enemies tell us from hell, is to build on the foundation already laid, and not to lay a new one for its own use. The article of justification by faith, for instance, is sound and good, if it be rooted in a heartfelt submission to the objective mysteries of the Apostles' Creed; whereas without this, as among our more unsacramental sects generally, it must be regarded as only a pestiferous delusion.

with a veil "which is done away in Christ." Christ's parables are mystical, resting on real and not simply notional analogies between the world of nature and the world of grace, which neither thought nor language can fully fathom, which can be *felt* only in the profoundest depths of the soul. The same may be said of his miracles. To a truly contemplative faith, they mean immeasurably more than they at once outwardly express. His teaching partook largely of the same character. "The words that I speak unto you," he said himself, "they are spirit and they are life." They are pregnant with a sense which goes far beyond either grammar or logic; missing which altogether, having no organ for it indeed, our rational exegesis too often turns them in'o mere "flesh that profiteth nothing." The sacred writers of the New Testament generally show more or less of the same quality; but most of all he who leaned on Jesus' bosom, and whom the ancients compare with the eagle soaring towards the sun. Without some sense for the mystical, no interpreter can understand or expound St. John. Who has not felt the force and beauty of the celebrated picture applied to him by Claudius: "Twilight and night; and through them the quick gleaming lightning. A soft evening cloud, and behind it the big full moon bodily!" Does this imply unintelligibleness, or the opposite of clear simplicity? According to Dr. Proudfit's scheme of thinking, it does; but listen to Olshausen, to say the least quite as competent a judge: "The thoughts of John have the greatest simplicity, and along with this a metaphysical spirituality, they carry in them logical sharpness, without having proceeded from the standpoint of mere reflection. Born from the depth of intuition, they are still far from the cloudiness and confusion of mysticism; expressed in the plainest language, they unite in themselves the depth of genuine *mystik* with the clearness and precision of genuine *scholastik*. Where indeed the intuitive powers are wanting, or lie still undeveloped, the depth of John however clear must appear to be darkness; but for such standpoint also the Gospel of John was not written."¹ Now we

¹ *Bib. Comm.* Vol. II. p. 24.—Take the following passage also to the same point from Schaff's *Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche*, p. 344: "With Paul, John possesses in common depth of knowledge. They are the two apostles, who have left for us the fullest and most developed schemes of doctrine. But their knowledge is of different sort. Paul, trained in the school learning of the Pharisees, is an uncommonly sharp thinker and skilful dialectician, exhibiting the Christian doctrines for intellectual comprehension, proceeding from ground to consequence, from cause to effect, from the general to the particular, from propositions to conclusions, with

do not pretend to make the Heidelberg Catechism of one character here, with this sacred composition ; we only make use of the example, to show the absurdity of the criticism that has been so pompously paraded against the whole idea of a mystical element in the Catechism, as well as to illustrate in what general sense we and others have attributed to it such a quality, and are disposed to vindicate for it the same honorable distinction still.

Let it be kept in mind, that we speak of it relatively to its own class. It is a *Reformed* symbol and must be judged of from the bosom of this confession. What we have said before of the genius of the Reformed confession, as being naturally unfavorable to the mystical element and disposed to move rather in the line of mere logical reflection, is too well established as a fact to be unsettled at all by the flimsy dialectics brought to bear upon it by Dr. Proudfit. It is acknowledged by all respectable writers on comparative symbolism. Not to speak of Zuingli, we find in Calvin here a spiritual nature very different from that of Luther. He is more rigorously rational and dialectic. This does not of itself imply reproach ; for if the Bible abounds in one of the elements now contrasted, it abounds in the other likewise. If John is mystical, Paul is no less logical, with the same title to inspiration. There is a sound rationalism in religion, as well as a sound mysticism ; though both terms, nakedly taken, carry in our language commonly a bad sense. This very fact, however, shows how possible it is for the right in either case to run into wrong ; and we are reminded by it, at the same time, that each tendency is exposed naturally to its own abuse, and not to that of the other. Thus it is, that the logical interest in religion, as we find it represented by the Reformed confession since the days of Zuingli and Calvin, though in itself a very good and necessary side of our common Christianity, carries in itself always notwithstanding a dangerous liability to become rationalistic. Not as if danger lay only on this side, and all was security on the other. But the danger of one side is not just that of the

true logical evidence and precision—a representative thus of genuine scholasticism (*Scholastik*) in the best sense of the word. The knowledge of John is intuition and contemplation. He *sees* his object with the soul (*Gemüth*), he takes in all as a single picture, and represents thus the deepest truths without proof, as an eye-witness, in their immediate originality. His knowledge of divine things is the deep reaching gaze of love, which always directs itself to the centre, and from this outwards embraces all points of the periphery at one glance. He is the representative of all genuine mysticism (*Mystik*)."

other. The constitutional leaning of the Reformed church is, not towards bad mysticism, but towards bad rationalism. Now what we have said in relation to the Heidelberg Catechism is simply this, that it goes beyond all other symbols of its own confession in a proper combination of the mystical element with the merely rational, in the business of religious instruction. This by no means denies to it the common quality of the Reformed theology, logical clearness and precision; but on the contrary assumes this rather to be the reigning character of the work. "The Heidelberg Catechism," we expressly say, "has regard throughout to the lawful claims of the understanding; its author was thoroughly versed in all the dialectic subtleties of the age, and an uncommonly fine logic in truth distinguishes its whole composition. But *along with this* runs, at the same time, a continual appeal to the interior sense of the soul, a sort of solemn under tone, sounding from the depths of the invisible world, which only an unction from the Holy One can enable any fully to hear and understand. The words are *often* felt, in this way, to mean much more than they logically express. The Catechism is no cold workmanship merely of the rationalizing intellect. It is full of feeling and faith."

It is not easy, of course, to prove or exemplify for the merely logical understanding the presence of a quality, which addresses itself wholly to a different organ. To be apprehended at all, it must be felt. We may appeal again, however, to the sympathy in which the Catechism stands with the theory of religion embodied in the Apostles' Creed, and its palpable disagreement here with the spirit and genius of modern Puritanism. In the view of the creed, all religion rests in the acknowledgment of the mystery of the incarnation and its necessary consequences, historically considered, in the felt living sense of these supernatural realities, submitted to as actually at hand in the world by faith. The system includes the idea of the church, as the medium of salvation, and of divine sacraments carrying in them objective force and power. But this churchly and sacramental side of religion, involves of itself the force of what we now speak of as the mystical interest in proper conjunction with the merely intellectual or rational. Puritanism, in its modern shape, may be said to lack it altogether. It deals with religion as a matter of purely individual opinion and private experience. It turns it objectively into a mere abstraction. With the Heidelberg Catechism, on the contrary, it is regarded as a living concrete power. The catechumen is set down in the bosom as it were of the new creation, as a divine supernatural fact, and is

taught to give his responses accordingly, not simply from the standpoint of outward reflection, (as in the case for instance of the excellent Westminster Catechism,) but from the condition of faith; the things being treated as of actual validity for him, as a member of the church by baptism, in virtue of what the church is for all the purposes of salvation by the constitution of its own glorious Head. Some have made this very feature an objection to the Catechism. But it agrees with all ecclesiastical antiquity, and falls in too with the general tone and style of the New Testament.

Look only at the sacramental doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism, the light especially in which it presents the mystery of the Saviour's presence in the holy eucharist. Dr. Proudfit, for some reason, avoids this point, only transiently touching on what he takes to be our disposition to lay too much stress on the mystical view of this sacrament. We have been a little surprised indeed, that in undertaking to vindicate the *innocence* of the Catechism against our representations, he should have taken no notice of what we have said of its differing from the Lutheran doctrine of the sacramental presence, on the question of mode only, and not at all on the question of fact. Some have pretended heretofore to deny this, and to make us out guilty of a serious error for asserting in favor of the old Reformed faith anything better than the rationalistic conception so common in modern times. We take it to be of some account, so far as this point is concerned, that Dr. Proudfit does not venture to make any open capital of the matter, however well suited it might seem at first view for his general purpose. This amounts in the circumstances to a sort of quiet acknowledgment, that here at least we have the advantage of the cause he represents; that the participation of Christ's glorified body in the sacrament, through the mirifical intervention of the Spirit, was held by the Reformed church generally in the sixteenth century; and that it is plainly taught, over and over again, in the Heidelberg Catechism. Dr. Proudfit knows too, that it is taught in the Confession of the Reformed Dutch church, in terms that shut out every sort of ambiguity. Does the Dutch church, at the present time, still hold fast to this part of her proper hereditary faith? Does our critic, Dr. Proudfit himself, regard it as anything more than a figure of rhetoric? We presume not to answer either of these questions. One thing is certain however; namely, that the sacramental doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism is not in conformity with the present reigning *Puritan* standard, and that it is distinguished from this precisely by its mystical element, by

its acknowledgment of a real mystery of grace in the holy sacrament, which was universally owned by the ancient church, but which Puritanism now sees fit to reject.¹ This distinction, however, implies a great deal more than itself nakedly considered. It may suit a certain style of theology, to conceive of the sacramental doctrine of the old Reformed faith as a sort of outward accident only, in no organic connection with its general system, and capable of being dissevered from it with gain rather than loss. But in its own nature, as we may easily enough see, the case is of a very different character. The doctrine in question must of necessity condition materially the whole system or scheme to which it belongs; and nothing therefore can be more precarious, than to think of measuring and trying this by another system, that is not conditioned in its constitution by any such doctrine whatever. It is in vain to affect little or no regard for the point here brought into view, as though it were after all a small matter that the old idea of sacramental grace has been so widely lost in the religious thinking of the present time. Unless we take the ground that the universal ancient church was out of its senses on this subject, and that original Protestantism labored also with regard to it under the most perfect delusion, we must see and feel that the modern error is something more than a single dead *fly* merely, causing the ointment of the apothecary to stink. It reaches far into the very life of faith and piety; and it is hard to say which class of persons most deserves indignant

¹ Dr. Proudfit dislikes our use of the word "mystery." It is painful, he says, to hear it brought forward so much, in connection with the church and the sacraments. It is a favorite term with Romanists, the proper badge indeed of the Papacy; "for which very reason," if we take his word for it, "the Reformers eschewed both the word and the thing." Could we well have however, we ask in return, a more palpable apology for laying stress on the word, at the present time, than just such a barefaced attempt in the bosom, not of New England-Congregationalism, but of the Reformed Dutch church, to kill and root out from Protestantism the whole glorious idea which the word represents? It is not true, that the Reformers eschewed either the word or the thing. Will it be pretended, that Luther made no account of the *mystery* of the holy eucharist, that he looked upon it as a mere "supper," in the low rationalistic sense insinuated (note p. 117) by Dr. Proudfit? And is it not just this unmystical view that Calvin stigmatizes as profane? The sacraments have always been mysteries for the faith of the church, and must remain so as long as there is any true faith in the world. The church itself is a mystery. All the articles of the creed are mysteries; not simply in the sense of unfathomable doctrines, but in the sense of gloriously awful supernatural realities, historically present for faith in the bosom of the world under its natural form. Of all this, Puritanism, we are sorry to say, seems now to have almost no sense whatever.

reprehension and rebuke ; those who wantonly discard the mystery of the sacrament altogether, as it was once universally received, or those who condescendingly profess to make still some account of it, and yet the next moment turn round and shake hands with the first openly unbelieving class, as being after all of one mind with it mainly in its virulent opposition to every churchly idea, and as having no power apparently to see any danger whatever in the contrary direction. Only think of the distinction between Pedobaptists and Anti-pedobaptists, the whole significance of which turns on the old idea of sacramental grace, sinking in the estimation of the first into the character of a mere secondary circumstance ; or of American Lutheranism betaking itself for support and backing, in its unsacramental tendencies, to a tribunal which holds the mystery of the holy catholic church for a figment, and charges the Apostles' creed with wholesale heresy !

But our critic finds another string to play his *ad captandum* strain upon, for the ear of popular prejudice particularly in his own church. We have made it a merit of the Heidelberg formula, that it takes care "to avoid the thorny, dialectic subtleties of Calvinism." This statement he affects to find "truly astonishing." Was it not called by way of eminence the Calvinistic Catechism ; and so attacked by its enemies ; and so received by all branches of the Reformed church ? "Why was its author banished from Bresslau as a Calvinist ?" Nay is it not called by Dr. N. himself a *Calvinistic* symbol ? This and much more we have to like declamatory purpose ; on the strength of which then the ground is boldly taken, that there is no truth in our assertion, that the hard knotty points in question are all brought out with marked prominence in the Catechism, and that it is the very height of temerity to represent it as avoiding them in any way whatever.

Now of all this we must be allowed to say in plain terms, that it is either very ignorant or else very dishonest. In the first place, does Dr. Proudfit really need to be informed, like the merest tyro in church history, that the term *Calvinistic*, as used in the sixteenth century, in opposition to the term "Lutheran," and as of one sense frequently with "Reformed," is not just of the same signification with this term as now popularly understood in its relation to Arminianism ? In our time, it carries in it at once a reference to the doctrine of the divine decrees, and is taken for the most part in no other sense ; whereas, in the age of the Reformation, its reference was most immediately to the doctrine of the holy sacraments. As distinguished from Luth-

eran, it had regard mainly to the proper Reformed view of the Lord's supper, as classically explained and defended by the great Genevan Reformer in his Institutes and other writings. In this sense only Melancthon, in the latter part of his life, was looked upon as a sort of *Calvinist*. In this sense it was notoriously, that Ursinus came under the reproach of *Calvinism*, in his native city Bresslau. In this sense the Palatinate became *Calvinistic* or Reformed in the year 1562; and in this sense mainly the Heidelberg Catechism was afterwards known and spoken of as a *Calvinistic* symbol.¹ It was not Lutheran. It went with Calvin, in opposition to Luther, on the mode of the eucharistic mystery.

In the next place, we ask again, does Dr. Proudfit really need to be informed, that the confessional distinction expressed by the title "*Reformed*," as opposed to Lutheranism, was not originally by any means synonymous with a formally professed allegiance to Calvin's theory of the decrees, much less with a full acknowledgment of all the knotty points of this theory as it was first published in his name. "The Protestants in Holland, Bremen, Poland, Hungary, and the Palatinate," says the historian Mosheim, speaking of the Reformed church in the sixteenth century "followed indeed the French and Helvetic churches in their sentiments concerning the eucharist, in the simplicity of their worship, and in their principles of ecclesiastical polity; but *not* in their notions of predestination, which intricate doctrine they left undefined, and submitted to the free examination and private judgment of every individual. It may farther be affirmed, that before the Synod of Dort, no Reformed church had obliged its members, by any special law, or article of faith, to adhere to the doctrine of the church of Geneva relating to the primary causes of the salvation of the elect or the ruin of the reprobate."² It is admitted by Mosheim, at the same time, that the

¹ We have heard of cases, in which advantage has been taken of this very amphibology, to draw both the members and the property of German congregations into the fold of Presbyterianism. "You are *Calvinistic*; that is the very title by which you hold your corporate rights; this however is *our* title; so you belong to us, the only distinction between us being that you are German and we are English; which is at an end, of course, as soon as you pass from the use of one language to the other." Many an honest German has been puzzled out of his own ecclesiastical identity by this logic; which possibly his English neighbor also, no wiser than himself, has used upon him with perfectly good faith.

² Eccles. Hist., Cent. XVI, Sect. III, Part II, Chap. II, (MacLaine's Translation).

greatest part of the Reformed doctors, in the countries now mentioned, fell by degrees of their own accord into the Genevan system; a fact "principally owing, no doubt, to the great reputation of the academy of Geneva, which was generally frequented, in this century, by those among the Reformed who were candidates for the ministry." Along with this tendency, however, went from the beginning also an endeavor in different quarters to qualify the rigors of the original system; whilst in some branches of the church at least, it was distinctly understood and avowed that this side of Calvinism formed no part of the public faith whatever. Such particularly was the case with the *German Reformed church*. The *Confession of Sigismund* (Niemeyer, p. 650, 651) expressly rejects the idea of unconditional decrees. The *Repetitio Anhaltina* (Niemeyer, p. 638, 639) carefully refuses to acknowledge any other cause or principle of election than what we find in the express word of the Gospel itself; according to which the preaching of repentance and grace is universal or for all, and the number of the saved is determined only by the fact of their obedience and faith; the predestination referring mainly to Christ, and God's immutable purpose to save in him, and by him, *sine prosopolepsia*, all that fly to him for redemption and cleave to him perseveringly to the end. The *Declaration of Cassel*, issued by the General Synod of Hessa, a. 1607, professes (art. 6) to believe and teach on the high mystery of election all that is written of it in the bible; "and beyond this," it adds, "we believe and teach nothing; but refrain rather from the hard terms employed by some others, that might be an occasion to the simple either of despair or of carnal security, and hold ourselves to such terms as may serve with men the purposes of firm consolation and true godly living: And to be still more explicit, our confession here is just the same with what Mr. Luther has drawn out from God's word in his Preface to the Epistle to the Romans."¹ Universally, we may say, the relation of the German Reformed church to the Lutheran was such as to involve, almost as a matter of course, this moderate view of predestination and its kindred points. It was not here in any special sense, that the two confessions in Germany felt

¹See HEPPE's late work "*Die Einführung der Verbesserungspunkte in Hessen von 1604–1610*," (a contribution to the history of the German Reformed church from original documents,) p. 74, 78. Here we have, according to Heppe, the doctrine of Luther and Melancthon in regard to predestination, "as the same is found also in the Heidelberg Catechism;" while on the sacraments the Declaration gives us Melancthonian Calvinism.

themselves divided. Both professed to rest on the same basis of the original Augsburg Confession. It was only when it came to the mode of the mystery, which both acknowledged in the Lord's supper, that they could not agree.

This explains the general character and posture of the Heidelberg Catechism. It is primarily the leading standard symbol of the German Reformed church. It is Calvinistic; but the force of this distinction lies mainly in its doctrine of the sacraments; while on the subject of the divine decrees, it falls in rather, as far as it goes, with the Melancthonian view, avoiding however the more knotty points of the matter altogether. This does not imply certainly, that it goes for Arminianism or Pelagianism, or that it expressly contradicts the points it refuses to teach. Dr Proudfit appeals to its universal reception among the Reformed churches, to prove that it must have contained all that the Synod of Dort, for instance, or the Westminster Assembly, held to be essential here to full orthodox belief.¹ But this is absurd. Such universal reception shows just the contrary; namely, that it did not contain all that might be exacted by the more rigorous Predestinarians; since in that case, how could it have suited the more moderate class, the Melancthonian spirit in particular of the German church from which it took its rise. It suited all, just *because* it stopped short of determinations in regard to which all were not of the same mind. In this view, it is not to be measured by the full theological system even of its own authors. It was not by any means necessary, that they should put into such a formulary, intended for public and general use, all the details of their own belief, as they might see fit to bring them forward in the lecture room or pulpit. It is evident, on the contrary, that this was avoided with deliberate purpose and design. The authors of the work have taken pains to hold their own theological convictions as it were in check, in order that the text might be more general, and in this way true

¹ "How must the Dutch, German, and Swiss Reformed churches, be amazed to find that they have been expounding from their pulpits, and teaching to their children, for almost three centuries, a Catechism in which doctrines which they have ever deemed vital and precious forms of evangelical truth, are 'avoided' and 'not brought forward as necessary objects of orthodox belief!' How incredibly strange that the Westminster Assembly never detected this Laodicean latitudinarianism, but blindly gave it their earnest commendation."—Why not go into hysterics at once over the deplorable thought, that all Christendom has been using for many more centuries the creed and the Lord's prayer, which yet labor here under still more dismal latitudinarianism.

to the objective church life with which they were surrounded. This we know was not by any means prepared, in the Palatinate, to accept what may be called extreme Calvinism, on the subject of the decrees; and from everything of that sort, accordingly, the Heidelberg symbol was made carefully to abstain.

"The Catechism," says *Ebrard*, "is known to follow the course of the Epistle to the Romans (with omission of Rom. ix-xi). The misery of man, redemption, and thankfulness, form the three main divisions. The disposition is throughout anthropological and soteriological, not speculative. If it has been rightly observed, that the Reformed theology rests on one speculative principle, that of dependance upon God in the predestinarian sense, let us take good care not to confound theology and the church; let us bear in mind, how just this Heidelberg Catechism, with its wholly anthropologico-soteriological view of the material principle of faith, has found such vast circulation in the Reformed church as a book of instruction, and wrought with so much effect on the practical church life. The predestinarian theory was tolerated in the Reformed church, and taken up as an organic member into her spiritual life; but it is one of the essential peculiarities precisely of this church, that with genuine catholicity she has tolerated side by side different schools and modes of apprehension. One who should identify the predestinarian system with the spirit of the Reformed church, would deal with her as the Flaccian party have done with the Lutheran. Along with Calvinism in the strict sense, is found in the Reformed church the more lax Zuinglianism, (I speak not now of the sacramental doctrine, but of church life generally,) and thirdly the Palatine or German Reformed churchdom. Here breathed Melancthon's spirit. Predestination, as all know, is nowhere taught in the Heidelberg Catechism with so much as a single word; the whole view has proceeded as it were out of Melancthon's heart."¹

Seisen, in his History of the Reformation in Heidelberg, takes the same view of Melancthon's relation to the church of the Palatinate, and to the Catechism; and says of this last expressly (p. 205) that the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination enters not formally into its teaching.

Vierordt, (Hist. of the Reformation in Baden, p. 467), disposes of the matter in the same way, with the somewhat dry and curt remark: "The doctrine of absolute election is not express-

¹ Dogma vom h. Abendm. Vol. II. p. 603, 604.

ed in the Heidelberg Catechism ; and only in later times have some tried to extract it artificially out of the 32nd question."

But a truce with authorities. The Catechism is before us, and may safely enough be allowed to speak for itself. What is the amount of our representation? Not that the general idea of election is wanting in its religious scheme ; much less that it is excluded or contradicted. Not that it refuses absolutely to serve as a basis for the theology of Dort or Westminster, if any think it necessary to carry out the Reformed doctrine in that way. Nothing at all of this sort ; but only, that it does not bring into view the more knotty points of Calvinism, that it takes care to avoid its thorny dialectic subtleties, that it stops short of certain hard positions in regard to which the Reformed church itself has not been of one mind, not urging them as " necessary objects of belief." And can there be any intelligent doubt on this subject? Dr. Proudfit does indeed make a show of triumphantly proving the contrary. But it is at best a very empty show, as any child may easily see that will take the trouble of examining his references. "The reader has but to take this work into his hand," he tells us, "and read over questions 1st, 2nd, 7th, 8th, (but if we would complete the enumeration, we must include by far the greater portion of the Catechism—we will only add therefore the 21st,) with the author's own exposition, and he will see these same 'hard, knotty points,' unfolded as rich life-germs of truth to all the uses of christian comfort and sanctification." This is so very loose and wide, as at once to convict itself of being totally without force. Strange indeed, if the Catechism should so teem with the character here in question, and the best theological eyes have failed to see it for so long a time! The questions here referred to say not a word in form of any of the hard points, now under consideration. The exposition of Ursinus goes occasionally farther than the text explained ; but this by no means authorises the idea, that the text in every such instance formally teaches what is thus brought in by the lecturer ; for what we have asserted is, that the formulary itself has not been carried out by the authors here to the full length even of their own convictions, that these were held in check rather for the purpose of making it more true to the general objective life it was formed to represent. It is not true indeed, that Ursinus does commit himself in his exposition to the hard extremes of Calvinism, in the way intimated by Dr. Proudfit. The references given in support of the assertion, prove nothing of the sort, and can hardly be said to have any relevancy whatever to the question in hand.*

* The topic of Predestination he handles in form under the 54th question,

But we look not now to this. What we have to do with is the explicit formal teaching of the Catechism itself. Were there a question as to the actual sense of any part of its text, as in the case for instance of what is said of the mystical side of the Lord's supper, all would depend on the author's own commentary. But where no part of the text is brought forward for interpretation, it is idle to fetch in any such help. The most that can be made of the author's exposition in that case, is that he considered the text a fair and fit basis for the use made of it in this way. We have not questioned the practicability of building on the Catechism a rigorous scheme of the divine decrees; nay, we have expressly said, that it could not have been endorsed by the Synod of Dort, if this body had not supposed its own theological system to be fairly involved in it so far as it went. But for all this, it would be ridiculous to pretend that all the determinations of the Synod of Dort are formally taught in the Heidelberg Catechism. And so we say, the hard points generally of metaphysical Calvinism are not there. To prove the contrary, it is not enough to get at them by derivation and roundabout construction. We must be pointed to some plain and direct teaching of the text itself: Where is the formal and explicit enunciation of these hard points to be found? In what terms are they made to challenge attention and regard? What questions bring them distinctly into view? Not the 1st, 2nd, 7th, 8th, or 21st certainly, to which we are referred by Dr. Proudfit; nor any others, we presume, on which he is likely soon to lay his discriminating finger.

To bring the case down to particulars. Where do we find the supralapsarian scheme presented in the Catechism? Where is the election of a certain number of mankind to everlasting life set forth as the root and principle of redemption, preceding in the order of nature the predestination of Him by whom it was to be accomplished? Which question is it, that limits the atonement to the range of this election, making it to have no reference to others, in spite of what is said of the Saviour's sufferings

as a sort of appendix "naturally growing out of the doctrine of the church." This of itself is enough to show, that it is nowhere to be found directly and explicitly in the Catechism itself; for no one will pretend that it lies in this question, otherwise at best than by remote theological involution, or that the question is not easily capable of being so taken as to avoid entirely the idea of absolutely unconditional decrees. On the fall of man, quest. 7, he distinctly rejects the supralapsarian view, making Adam's sin to have been the object only of God's foreknowledge, which did not involve the necessity of what actually took place.

in Quest. 37, as being of vicarious force, in body and soul, for "the sins of *all mankind*?" Where is it taught that grace is irresistible, or that the issue of it is not conditioned by the human will? What question affirms the absolute predestination of a given portion of the human race to perdition? Where is the doctrine of the decrees directly defined or asserted in any shape?

These are some of the *hard points*, which we say the Heidelberg Catechism has taken care to avoid; and Dr. Proudfit's rhodomontade to the contrary is worth just nothing at all, till he shall condescend to come to the written text of the formulary itself, and quote question and line in proof of his bold contradictions. His course, in the whole matter, is by no means honorable and fair. It is very well known, that these hard points of Calvinism have been of more or less fluctuating authority, for the general system so called, from the beginning. In the Synod of Dort itself, the supralapsarian hypothesis could not stand.³ And what a tendency there is with our Calvinistic bodies generally in these latter days, to mollify greatly, if not absolutely to throw away, much that belongs to the system in its full metaphysical glory, is on all sides sufficiently clear and well understood. We seriously question, indeed, whether even Dr. Proudfit himself is prepared deliberately to subscribe to all the "thorny dialectic subtleties" now in consideration—supralapsarianism for instance, and an atonement for a part of the human family only and not for the whole. And yet he falls upon our assertion that the Heidelberg Catechism avoids these subtleties

³ Speaking of the beginning of the 17th century, (Eccl. Hist. sect II, part II, chap. II), Mosheim tells us: "There was not any public law or confession of faith that obliged the pastors of the Reformed churches, in any part of the world to conform their sentiments to the theological doctrines that were adopted and taught at Geneva. And accordingly there were many, who either rejected entirely the doctrine of that academy on these intricate points, or received it with certain restrictions and modifications. Nay, even those who were in general attached to the theological system of Geneva, were not perfectly agreed about the manner of explaining the doctrine relating to the divine decrees. The greatest part were of opinion, that God had only *permitted* the first man to fall into transgression, without positively *predetermining* his fall. But others went much farther, and presumptuously forgetting their own ignorance on the one hand and the wisdom and equity of the divine counsels on the other, maintained that God, in order to exercise and display his awful justice and his free mercy had decreed from all eternity the transgression of Adam; and so ordered the course of events, that our first parents could not possibly avoid their unhappy fall."

and knotty points, as though it were tantamount at once to saying, that it has nothing to do with the Calvinistic system in any shape; over against which false accusation, (a mere man of straw thus set up by himself,) he then proceeds to fight lustily, with notes of admiration and other such artillery, till he has to his own satisfaction fairly demolished it, proving effectually that Ursinus was no Pelagian, and that his Catechism is not guilty of "Laodicean latitudinarianism" on the doctrines of grace! As if there were no intermediate ground to be thought of now in the case, between the formal teaching of the extreme points of Calvinism, and a lukewarm indifference to the proper evangelical substance of the system! What then are we to make of the Augsburg Confession? What must we think of Melancthon, not to speak of Luther himself the great coryphaeus of the Reformation? Must the whole Lutheran theology be branded as Pelagian and Laodicean, because it refuses the hard points of Geneva? So it would seem, with *a fortiori* consequence, from Dr. Proudfit's logic; for this theology positively disowns, in the case of some of these intricate knots, what the Heidelberg Catechism at worst but passes over with modest and discreet silence.

We cherish all proper regard for the Reformed Dutch church, and have no wish to abridge in the least its right to carry out the Calvinistic scheme in its own way; but we must earnestly protest, at the same time, against every attempt to convert this liberty into a yoke for the neck of the German church, such as from the beginning it has never yet been willing to accept or bear. The two bodies are closely related in their past history, and have much of a common genius, the kindly sense of which may not soon be extinguished, we sincerely trust, on either side.¹ But with all this they are not now, and never have been of just the same theological constitution and complexion. On the high points of Calvinism, in particular, the German Reformed church has always refused to go even so far as the Belgic Confession or the Decrees of the Synod of Dort, and much less to the *ultima*

¹ This ecclesiastical consanguinity is often recognized, and pleasingly acknowledged, in the peculiar sort of home feeling, which the delegates of one body experience when taking part in the synodical sessions and proceedings of the other. On the Dutch side the relationship is best understood, in the nature of the case, by the true Dutch element still found in that church; as distinguished from the large infusion of foreign life, (more or less Puritanic,) which has already gone far to undermine the old spirit.

thule of supralapsarian predestination.* The platform of our faith here is wide and free. If any choose to be extreme predestinationists, they have full liberty to follow their particular inclination. But they are not allowed to narrow the platform itself to any such tight measure. Any attempt to do so, would be met at once by an overwhelming protest, from all parts of the church. There is a difference here between the Dutch and German churches, with all their close historical relationship, which it is very important always to bear in mind; a difference that grows mainly out of another relationship on the German side; that, namely, which this bears at the same time to confessional Lutheranism. It is not easy to understand or feel the full force of this, (as we have learned experimentally) without

* See on the character of the German Reformed church, and its relation to Lutheranism and Calvinism, an interesting article by Dr. H. HEPPE, published in Ullmann's *Studien und Kirtiken*, July 1850. With Calvin, the absolute decree forms the generative principle of all theology. His system turns on it as a pivot, from beginning to end, in a way intrinsically fatal at last even to his own doctrine of the sacraments. The Reformed Confessions generally, as we have before seen, were not willing to follow it out to its proper metaphysical end. "Almost all of them," according to Heppe, "take the *infralapsarian* view, (which cuts the life-nerve of Calvin's system,) and at the Synod of Dort, Gomar found himself, with his supralapsarian theory, in the position almost of a separatist. Only three Confessions present Calvin's dogma in its pure grain, the *Consensus of Geneva*, the *Helvetic Formula* of 1675, and the *Westminster Confession* of the Puritans. The first was not subscribed probably even by Zurich, among all the other Swiss churches. The second must be regarded as a posthumous work of the schools, which in a very short time passed into practical oblivion. So that neither the one nor the other document is of any force in evidence of what was the reigning consciousness of the Reformed church; and the Westminster Confession remains thus the *only* symbol of full predestinarianism,—proof enough, that such Calvinism, arraying itself against the idea of a historical and sacramental church and resolving all into the *decretum Dei absolutum*, carries in it no proper power of life." But now in direct opposition to the abstract principle of Calvinism, the German Reformation roots itself from the start in the historical and objective idea of the church. Out of this grew the Melancthonian tendency as one side of the general movement, over against high Lutheranism as we have it in the Form of Concord; the result of which was the German Reformed church, established as a common interest in the Palatinate, in Hesse, and in Brandenburg. This was Calvinistic in its sacramental doctrine, and fell in more or less with Calvinism also at other points; but it never gave up its distinctively German construction of theology. The Elector Frederick most distinctly professed to abide always by the Augsburg Confession, and the doctrinal views of Melancthon. The Heidelberg Catechism is *soteriologically* constructed, and follows Melancthon's method and spirit throughout. Of predestination in the Calvinistic sense, we hear not a word. Such, we say, is the view taken of the whole case, in this article by Heppe.

being in the bosom of the German Reformed church itself, and sharing in its actual theological life. No other branch of the Reformed church in this country can be said to understand Lutheranism, or to have any natural ecclesiastical sympathy with its proper genius and soul.* Now this affinity we have just as little right to ignore or forget, as we have to lose sight of the other. When the sense of it is lost, the constitutional life of the German Reformed church will be also at an end. Let the Dutch church understand this. Our Calvinism is not just that of the Synod of Dort; and we are not willing to admit of course, in the face of all past history, that the Heidelberg Catechism must be rigorously construed by any such rule. In all this however we quarrel not with the Dutch church, which has full right certainly, as we have said before, to carry out her confessional system in her own way; all we ask is, that the German church may be considered free also to stop short here, as she has ever done, with the simple text of the Catechism itself, leaving the hard points that lie beyond without symbolical determination, for theology to solve and settle afterwards as it best can.

It only remains, to notice briefly the criticism bestowed by Dr. Proudfit on Mr. Williard's translation itself. We have had no opportunity to compare this with the original text, and can therefore say nothing positively as to the ability and fidelity with which it has been executed. But it is easy enough to see, from the face of such evidence as we have before us, that the general criticism of the Brunswick Professor is exceedingly unfair.

He affects to call in question the worth and sufficiency of Mr. Williard's Latin text, (the Geneva edition of 1616) without any good reason that we can see whatever. He takes the translator solemnly to task, at the same time, for venturing out of his copy, in a few instances, to bring in short extracts from the "old English translation by Parry;" although these extracts, (three in number, we believe, and amounting in all to perhaps two pages of matter,) are carefully noted in the text itself as *addenda*, with

* It is remarkable, that no other Reformed church, (if we are rightly informed,) keeps up any ecclesiastical correspondence with any part of the Lutheran body in this country. A high wall of separation is made thus to shut out this whole confessional interest, which is yet glorified again in history, when it suits, as the main wing of the Reformation. What is thus excluded too, is especially the idea of Lutheranism in its true original shape. By giving up its own glorious confessional life, the system (then known as "American Lutheranism") propitiates indeed some Puritan favor; but it falls at the same time into the predicament of a characterless Pelagian sect, with which no church fellowship is to be desired.

due warning given of the fact besides in the Preface. In these extracts some alterations are made in Parry's antiquated style, "to adapt it to the taste," Mr. Williard says, "of the modern reader." Now only hear Professor Proudfit on this point: "In this practice, we must remind him that he has departed from all the just principles which ought to guide a translator. We cannot well conceive a larger 'liberty,' than for a translator to 'insert short extracts' from unknown sources, changing the style and construction so as to adapt it to the *taste* of the modern reader!" The word *taste* italicised, to convey the perfectly gratuitous and we will add *ungentlemanly* insinuation, that the case may include some theological accommodation, instead of the mere fashion of language, the actual "foisting in" of a new sense with sinister purpose and regard.¹ Miserable balderdash!

But there are instances not a few of bad translation in the book, according to our critic. We can only say, not having the original at hand, that the book does not read like a bad translation; on the contrary it runs very clearly and smoothly, more so than translations do commonly, and makes at all events very good sense. Dr. Proudfit quotes a few specimens in proof of his charge; but they are after all of no very considerable account; and we know not how far they may be attributable to variations in the original text. We pretend not however to say that the translation is exempt from errors. That could hardly be expected in the first edition of so large a work. All we wish to say is, that Dr. Proudfit's criticism here is chargeable with gross exaggeration.

So as regards the typographical and general editorial execution of the work. It is declared to be unpardonably negligent and inaccurate! This accusation at least, we feel at liberty bluntly to contradict. Typographical errors may indeed be found; but they certainly need some hunting. They are not at once patent. Pages need to be gone over, somewhat microscopically too in many cases, to find them. Then as for the general style of the book, it may easily enough be left to speak for itself; as it has already in truth won in its own favor, on all sides, the highest commendation and praise. Seldom do we meet with a religious

¹ It is a little queer, that one ground of offence with Williard's work at first in a certain quarter, we are told, was that it did not contain a portion of matter found in Parry's book, which is not from Ursinus at all. The omission was set down for a wilful *suppressio veri*, and evidence of a dreadful conspiracy with Mercersburg to murder the proper life of the Heidelberg Catechism!

work of like size, for common popular use, in the case of which the outward costume both of paper and type is less open to any fair reproach.

But three whole questions, the 84th, 85th and 95th, are left out altogether; "the exposition meanwhile jogging on, as if quite unconscious that it had parted company with the text." Nine readers out of ten, we presume, would infer from the way in which this is brought forward by Dr. Proudfit, that these questions were dropped, commentary and all, (the fault perhaps of Mr. Williard's bad Latin copy,) while the worthy translator nevertheless went straight ahead with his work, having no sense seemingly of the *hiatus valde deflendus*, by which these parts of the catechetical text were thus summarily annihilated! But what is the actual amount of the ominous omission in the end? Why this simply, that these three questions themselves do not appear in their proper place, at the head of the sections or chapters of exposition to which they belong; while in truth no part whatever of the exposition itself is broken or wanting in any way. It all comes thus to an easily intelligible oversight of the press, which is a blemish certainly for this first impression of the work, but by no means such a damning sin as it might appear to be from the ambiguous form of Dr. Proudfit's charge.

It is plain enough after all, however, that the criticism of Mr. Williard's work forms but a small part of the real object of Dr. Proudfit's article; the main purpose of it is to assail the Mordecai sitting at the gate, our Introduction namely on the life and character of Ursinus. In what spirit, and with what sort of effect, this has been done, we have now tried to make in some measure apparent. The article is sufficiently ostentatious and ambitious; it is ushered in with quite a historical dissertation on the subject of catechetical instruction, abounds in sophomorical scraps of Latin, (the author being a professor of the dead languages,) and makes a wonderful parade throughout of doing up its work in a smashing wholesale way. But in all this there is a great deal more show than substance. The historical introduction is but little to the point; the sophomorical scraps of Latin prove nothing; and what affects to be smashing argument resolves itself, on near inspection, into empty smoke or something worse. The argument consists for the most part in creating false issues, by pushing qualified statements out to an extreme sense, by exaggerating and caricaturing points of controversy, in one word by setting up men of straw; over whom an easy victory is gained, the weight of which is then pompously employed to crush what has been thus misrepresented and abused. Dr.

Proudfit finds it an easy task to show that the Heidelberg Catechism has no sympathy with Romanism, is not made up of unintelligible mystification, and falls in with the general Augustinian theory of salvation in opposition to every sort of Pelagianism; and this he plays off as an overwhelming contradiction to our statement, that the Catechism stands pre-eminent among Reformed or Calvinistic symbols for its catholic historical spirit, for its sense of the mystical interest in religion in connection with the intellectual, and for its moderation and reserve in not urging the Calvinistic system to its metaphysical extremes. The logic certainly is both easy and cheap.

We are glad to understand, that the first edition of Mr. Williard's book is already off his hands, and that the demand for it is such as to call for a second. The circulation is of course so far mainly within the German church. It would be a pity if the present *Introduction* merely should stand in the way of its being favorably received in the Reformed Dutch church, as Dr. Proudfit seems to think it should and must do. We beg leave therefore to suggest a simple remedy for the evil. Let a separate edition be engaged for the special use of this venerable sister denomination, carefully revised and with the *Introduction* left out. Or if preferred, let *another* *Introduction* be drawn up, either by Dr. Proudfit himself or by somebody else, calculated for the meridian of New Brunswick, and conformed in all respects theologically to the reigning Puritan standard of the present time. Let it roundly affirm, that on the subject of the decrees the formal teaching of the Heidelberg Catechism falls not a whit behind the determinations of the Synod of Dort, that it owns no sympathy whatever with the catholic ideas of the ancient church, that it eschews religiously the whole mystical interest in religion and moves only in the sphere of the logical understanding, that it has in it no inward relationship whatever to Lutheranism, that the true key to its sense and spirit should be sought rather in New England Puritanism, that it is unchurchly and unsacramental throughout, acknowledging no objective grace, no mystery at all, (just as little, be it whispered, as Art. XXXV of the Belgic Confession,) in the holy sacraments, on a full par thus with the universal sectarian rationalism of the day. Let this be the standpoint, we say, of the new *Introduction*, got up for the special use and benefit of the Reformed Dutch church; and if the Dutch church, generally should choose to be satisfied with it, the world at large, we presume, will not feel it necessary to make any objection.

J. W. N.

LATIN PRONUNCIATION.

Elements of Latin Pronunciation, for the use of Students in Language, Law, Medicine, Zoology, Botany, and the Sciences generally in which Latin words are used. By S. S. HALDEMAN, A. M., Professor of Natural History in the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1851. 12mo., pp. 76.

THOSE of us students in Pennsylvania, who were inducted into the rudiments of the Latin Language some thirty years ago, well remember with what care we were taught our proper pronunciation. As one of the fundamental maxims it was laid down to us in the Grammar of Dr. Ross, which we learned by heart, that an Anglicized pronunciation of Latin must be cautiously avoided. The observance of this injunction, however, at any rate, so far as the letters were concerned, we were pleased to find, was not very difficult. The learned shibboleth, upon which we soon began to pride ourselves, consisted in the proper enunciation of two vowels, A and E. The sounds of the other letters coincided mostly with those of the English; but *a* we were constantly enjoined to pronounce *ah*, as heard in the English word *far*, and *e*, *aye*, as heard in the English word *prey* or *there*, without any variations. This, in those blissful days, we supposed to be the general custom in all learned nations. What was our astonishment then, soon afterwards, in coming in contact with New England grammars, which have long since, we are almost sorry to say it, in a great measure superseded in Pennsylvania our beloved Ross's, to find it laid down among other extenuating rules that *a* and *e*, when at the end of an accented syllable, must be pronounced as the same vowels in the same positions in English. Of *pá-ter* and *dé-dit*, for instance, the first syllables must be uttered with the same sounds as those in the English words, *fatal* and *metre*. "Oh, what a fall was there, my countrymen!" We could not succumb to it. We were constrained to admit that in many particulars these new grammars were in advance of our old favorite's, especially in the syntax, but we could not give up our superior pronunciation. We felt as proud of it as did the old Seceder lady, of whom we have somewhere heard, when asked to tell the difference between the tenets of her own church and those of the Presbyterian. "Difference!" she exclaimed. "And dinna ye ken the difference! Why 'tis awfu'; as you yoursel' would easily ken did ye but come and hear ane o' our learned ministers frae the

pulpit- Yours o' the ither kirk, in the Bible when they come to the word, Mesopotamia, aye say it in a finified way: Mesopotá-mia; but ours o' the orthodox faith, when they come to it, aye fling open their mou's braidly and spak it out: Mesopotáh-miah, wi' a heavenly sound."

Having stated to a learned New England teacher, a few years ago, my predilection for this mode of pronunciation he expressed his utter astonishment that a man of my taste, as he was pleased to say, would wish to ever sanction any Scotch Irish intonations in the refined language of ancient Rome. I reminded him, however, as my more extended philological reading had then enabled me, that this sublime, sonorous pronunciation of the vowels *a* and *e* was not at all restricted to any dialect of Scotland or Ireland, as he himself well knew, but that it was to be heard also at the present day in almost all the polished languages on the continent of Europe.

"Granting this to be a fact," he replied, "it follows not thence certainly that in our country these two vowels should be uttered as they are in those foreign lands, in our Latin. The ancient pronunciation of this language having, in a great measure, been lost, you are well aware that in different modern nations the learned have accommodated the sounds in its letters and syllables as far as possible to similar ones of their own. As then in these United States the English Language prevails, it certainly becomes us to pronounce our Latin according to the English usage."

"I admit," said I, "that the English is the prevailing speech in our country; but does this form any insuperable bar, in case the mode of pronunciation on the continent of Europe accords best with the genius of the ancient Latin Language, to our adopting it generally in our classical reading and speaking?"

"Oh," cried he, "I perceive that your wishes are not limited. You are pleading, it seems, for a foreign enunciation not only of your two favorite vowels but of the whole alphabet! You would fain introduce into our American Latin an Italian or German pronunciation not only of *a* and *e* but of all the other vowels, diphthongs and consonants!"

"Not introduce," said I, "if you please, but extend its use; as in some of our best Literary Institutions, you are well aware, it has long since been introduced. As this pronunciation is, in a manner, lineally descended from the ancient Latin, and it certainly comes nearer to the original, would it not be well to use it generally in all our classical schools and colleges?"

What reply he made to this suggestion I do not now remem-

ber; but I feel persuaded that, in the end, I came off decidedly the better in the argument. Here I would have rested on my laurels, being satisfied; but since I have met with some who would fain carry this reform still higher. Even in Italy, they say, some of the letters have deviated considerably from their ancient sounds; and would it not be well, they ask, by ascertaining this and adopting the earliest mode of expressing them, to approach in our Latin reading as near as possible to the original? To those I would reply: 'Tis a consummation devoutly to be wished.' As the Latin letters too were, in all likelihood, phonetic, retaining in all positions the same sounds, being varied only in length, were these once fully ascertained and settled, their pronunciation would be easy. Of reviving their old sounds the greatest difficulty in the way, however, would be modern custom and prejudice. It is hard to overcome old habits. As, for instance, to adduce one case out of several, in nearly all Europe, as is well known, in Latin the letter *c* before *e*, *i*, *y*, *ae* or *oe*, is pronounced like our English *s*, but, in all other positions, like *k*; whereas with the ancient Romans it had always the force of the last mentioned guttural. Could we, however, with all our love for ancient usage, be easily brought back to the earliest mode of expression, and, in reading the classics, say *Kike-ro* for *Cicero*, *kircum* for *circum*, &c? In English we are familiar with so many words derived from the Latin in all of which the *c*, as above located, has this sibilant sound that our modern ears, we fancy, could hardly be brought to hear with pleasure their primitives in Latin pronounced otherwise.

Be this as it may, we feel persuaded, however, that no student in the Latin can be thorough without a knowledge of its ancient pronunciation. Only in this way can he arrive at an apprehension of its etymology, which is so essential to the proper understanding of a language. By restoring words to their ancient sounds he will at once be struck by close and beautiful relationships and resemblances between them and others, which he had never before suspected; and these too by no means confined to the Latin, but often existing between them and others in other languages. In this way too, as can easily be perceived, the study becomes of vast account in the researches of the ethnologist. Hitherto this subject has been kept, in a great measure, out of view. Our modern grammarians make no mention of it. As some of our theologians care little about ancient creeds or of looking too narrowly into ecclesiastical history lest it might unsettle some of their favorite dogmas, so many of our grammarians care not much about making any allusion to the ancient

powers of the letters lest it might disturb the faith of students in their present, approved, national modes of pronouncing Latin. We trust this little work of Prof. Haldeman may serve to awaken a deeper interest in the subject. That philosophical talent and tact so essential for investigations in natural science, which he is well known eminently to possess, he has here brought to bear on the elements of the Latin Language with peculiar success. His conclusions, we fancy, are generally, if not always, correct, as they are founded on philosophical principles, having been drawn from various reliable materials both ancient and modern, in a manner almost as satisfactory and as safely to be trusted as the deductions of mathematics. These, in most cases, agree with those of other eminent philologists, but in some they are entirely new. Thus has he furnished a work which was much wanted in our country ; a cheap, convenient manual of only seventy-six pages, duodecimo, embracing the results of deep research, which no student of the ancient languages or indeed of any of the sciences in which Latin words are used, should ever be without.

Mercersburg, Pa.

W. M. N.

SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE.¹

Lev. xxvii: 30-32.

Ex. xxx: 13-16.

1 Cor. xvi: 1-2.

Act. xx: 35.

BENEVOLENCE is a necessary manifestation of *love*, which, as the product of a living faith, constitutes the cardinal virtue of Christianity, the fulfilment of the whole moral law. You might as well separate the sun from light and heat, as love from charity and benevolence. Faith without works is dead, so is love without acts of charity. The Apostle calls upon us to love, not with words or with the tongue only, but "in deed and in truth." All that we are and that we possess, as natural men and as regenerate christians, we owe to the free mercy of God, our Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier, and we are therefore bound, by the most sacred of obligations, to love Him in return by keeping His commandments. We have no right to live, unless we live for the glory of God and for the good of our fellow men. It is only in this way, that we can secure true happiness on earth and eternal bliss in heaven.

Our first and principal duty is to consecrate our *lives*, our persons and services to the Lord, who gave Himself for us. Our second duty which is already involved in the first, requires us to devote our *property* and our *possessions* to the Lord. But how shall this be done? We cannot give our money directly to Him, nor does He need it. Still we give it to Him by giving it to His cause, to the furtherance of His kingdom in the world, and to the promotion of every good work connected with His glory and the salvation of men. Yea, even a drink of water offered to the lowliest of His disciples in time of need, He will regard as offered to Himself, and reward it openly on the great day of account. For He identifies His cause in condescending love with the cause of His people, and if we serve the church, which is His body, in the proper spirit and from pure motives, we serve Him and promote His glory, while we at the same time realize the end of our being and secure the salvation of our immortal soul.

¹ A Sermon preached by appointment before the Synod of the German Reformed Church of the U. S., at Lancaster, Pa., on the 20th of October, 1851, and published by request of the Synod.

Benevolence ought, however, not to be looked upon merely as a duty, but at the same time as a *pleasure* and *privilege*. "It is more blessed," says Christ, "to give than to receive." God is love, and as such the fountain of all bliss. All His works are manifestations of His love, whose nature consists in self-communication, in going out of itself and entering into its object. He delights in creating, preserving, redeeming and perfecting man, formed in His image, and in pouring upon him His choicest blessings, yea in making him a partaker of His own glory. The more we love, the more godlike and happy we become. He who does not give cheerfully, but merely from a feeling of duty or from outward compulsion, has not yet the gospel-spirit and denies himself the sweetest and purest enjoyment. As selfishness is the principle of sin and the source of all misery, so its opposite, love to God and man, is the principle of holiness and the fountain of true happiness.

The *objects* of christian benevolence are, the maintenance and promotion of virtue and religion at home and abroad, and the support of the poor. To provide for these objects it is of the greatest importance to follow a certain *method* or *system*. God is a God of order, in all His works and ways. Order and regularity are the secret of success in every line of business. Why is it that certain denominations, whose membership mostly belong to the middle and poorer classes of society, contribute such large sums annually for the benevolent operations of the Church, whilst other denominations of equally sound doctrine, of as much piety in other respects, and of greater wealth contribute much less? Why can the Moravians and the Methodists, for instance, support so many ministers and missionaries at home and abroad? Why can the Roman Catholics build such costly cathedrals and establish so many charitable institutions? Because they pursue a regular system of benevolence and train all their members to give, however small the individual donations may be. A great many rivulets make a large stream, and a large quantity of small stones an imposing building. The comparatively slow progress and languishing condition of most of the benevolent operations in the German Churches of this country, is greatly, if not altogether, owing to the want of such a general system of co-operation. A few of our liberal members have thus far carried nearly the whole burden of our general enterprises, whilst perhaps the majority have done little or nothing towards any of them.

It is said sometimes, that the German population are constitutionally illiberal and close. But this is refuted by facts. Fran-

ke's Orphan House at Halle and many similar institutions founded by the Pietists in Wiüttemberg, are to be numbered amongst the brightest monuments of active benevolence. The Moravian Society is of German origin and complexion, and history hardly furnishes an equal number of Christians of any creed, who in proportion to their means have shown so much liberality and self-sacrifice in the work of missions. The German mind and character has abundantly proven itself to be capable of the greatest devotion and self-sacrifice, in almost every department of intellectual and moral activity; why should it not be equally capable of consecrating its perishing earthly treasures to the cause of truth, virtue and religion? If we succeed in training our churches to a regular system of benevolence, we shall have no difficulty in supporting our pastors, in building churches, in founding parochial schools, academies, colleges and seminaries of theology, in educating pious young men for the ministry of the gospel, in providing for the poor and the needy, and in doing our mite towards carrying the innumerable blessings of christianity to the uttermost parts of the world.

The subject of *systematic benevolence* then is of no small importance to us at this time, and closely connected with all our interests, with our external and internal prosperity as a branch of the church of Jesus Christ. I do not flatter myself that I shall do justice at all to this subject in the remarks which I intend to offer, on this occasion, at the request of Synod, or be able to propose a plan which may give entire satisfaction to our ministers and laymen. But I hope, I may at least succeed in spreading some light and in suggesting some ideas, which may be of service in the synodical discussion on the subject, and in the formation of that scheme of benevolence which may finally be agreed upon for the benefit of our beloved Zion. Believing that the word of God and the history of His church are, as in every thing connected with religion, so also in this respect our best and only sure guides, I shall speak first of the *Jewish* system of liberality as established by Jehovah Himself in the Old Testament; secondly of the liberality of the early *Christian* Church; and in the third place make the practical application of the lessons of revelation and of history to our *present* circumstances in our *German Churches of America*. It is expected that the last part should be made most prominent, in view of the practical purpose before us. The limits of a sermon, however, will of course, only permit me, to present the subject in its general outlines.

I. Systematic Benevolence amongst the Jews.

In the Old Testament dispensation, God had ordained a fixed rule for the exercise of benevolence.

1. He prescribed three kinds of regular taxes for the support of *religion*.

a. In the first place he required of the Jews, who were originally all possessed of real property, the *tenth part* of all the produce of the soil and the herd, or the corresponding value in money, for the support of the priesthood. "And all the tithe of the land, whether of the seed of the land, or of the fruit of the tree, is the Lord's; it is holy unto the Lord. And if a man will at all redeem ought of his tithes, he shall add thereto the fifth part thereof. And concerning the tithe of the herd, or of the flock, even of whatsoever passeth under the rod, the tenth shall be holy unto the Lord," Lev. 27: 30-32; comp. Num. 18: 21-26; Deut. xiv: 22-27; Nehem. x: 37-39. This tithe, like all other tributes, the Jews were properly to give to the Lord Himself, and He then made it over, as a heritage, to the Levites, who had no real property, Num. xviii: 24. The Levites again had to give the tithe of this tithe to the Priests, Num. xviii: 26ff; Nehem. x: 38. This institution was not originated, but only improved and developed by the Mosaic law. We find phrases of it already at an earlier period in the days of Abraham, who offered the tenth of his conquest to Melchisedec, the mysterious priest of the most high God (Gen. xiv: 20; Heb. vii: 2). Yea even amongst heathen nations the custom prevailed, to consecrate to some god or goddess the tenth part of the produce of the soil, of the industrial gain and the spoils of war, as we learn from Herodotus, Xenophon, Pausanias, Plutarchus, Plinius, Macrobius, Tustinus and other ancient writers. This fact proves, how natural such an institution was and how easily it fell in with the general religious wants of humanity.

b. In the second place, the Israelites were required to offer to the Lord a part of the *first fruits* of all the agricultural produce, raw as well as prepared for human use, (such as wheat, fruits of trees, grapes, cider, oil, flour,) before they made use of the rest, Ex. xxiii: 19; Num. xviii: 12f; Deut. xxvi: 2ff; Nehem. x: 33, etc. These offerings were eaten by the priests, (Deut. xviii: 3f; Ezech. xxxiv: 30f;) their measure and number, however, was not prescribed, but left to the free will of the individual. In addition to this, the whole nation, in order to show their gratitude for the blessing of harvest, used to bring on each Passover a sheaf of the first fruits, and on each Pentecost two

wave-loaves of two tenth-deals, with animal offerings, to the priest as a sacrifice unto the Lord, Lev. xxiii: 10-20.

c. The third regular tribute was intended for the support of the national sanctuary, first the *tabernacle* and afterwards the *temple* of Jerusalem. Every Israelite of twenty years and above was obliged to give annually for this object *half a shekel*, or a didrachma, i. e. a silver coin of thirty cents value, Exod. xxx: 13ff; 2 Chron. xxiv: 6; Matth. xvii: 24-27.

These were the ordinary taxes which had to be paid by all the Jews, even by those who lived out of Palestine, for the maintenance and promotion of the O. T. religion.

2. The second object of benevolence, the support of the *poor*, who are found in every nation and under the best form of government, was very wisely provided for by the Mosaic law. To them was left an after harvest on the fields, olive-yards and vineyards, Lev. xix: 9, 10; Deut. xxiv: 19-21. Moreover in the sabbath year, that is in every seventh year, when the soil was not cultivated, the poor, the widows, the orphans and the strangers had free access to all that grew spontaneously in the fields and in vineyards, Lev. xxv: 5, 6; and they were to be invited besides to the meals of tithe, which took place every three years before the dwelling of every citizen, Deut. xiv: 28f, xxvi: 12-14. Finally, the year of jubilee, i. e. every fiftieth year, restored the equality, renewed the whole theocracy and returned to destitute Israelites the lost possession of their family property, Lev. xxv: 8-17-39-41; xxvii: 17ff.

If we add to these regular gifts of benevolence the voluntary deeds of charity, and the extraordinary contributions for particular occasions, such as the building of the temple and of synagogues, we may suppose that many a pious Jew gave not less than the fourth or even the third part of his annual income to the Lord. Of Zacchaeus, who was, however, already touched by the spirit of the gospel, which ought to make men still more liberal than the law, we learn Luke xix: 8, that he gave even the half of his goods to the poor, and was willing, if he had taken any thing from any man unjustly, to restore it to him four fold. And yet this was no loss, but a gain and a blessing. In proportion to their faithfulness in the discharge of these duties, the nation prospered externally and internally. "Honor the Lord with thy substance and with the first fruits of all thine increase: So shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine," Prov. iii: 9, 10. "There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty. The liberal

soul shall be made fat, and he that watereth shall be watered also himself," Prov. xi: 24, 25. "He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord; and that which he hath given, will He pay him again," Prov. xix: 17, (cp. Ps. xxxxi: 2-4, Ps. 112: 5-9, Tob. iv: 11; xii: 9.) The same law of divine reward is expressed also in the New Test. by our Saviour Himself: "Give and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down and shaken together and running over, shall men give unto your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again," Luke vi: 38.

The care and administration of those legal and voluntary sacrifices was entrusted to special curators, and thirteen chests called "trumpets" on account of their shape, were placed in the outer court of the temple for their reception, 2 Chr. xxxi: 11, 12, Nehem. x: 38, 39. There the pious widow in the gospel deposited her mite, Marc. xii: 41ff. Besides every synagogue had a chest for the poor, into which two men deposited the collected alms, and out of these every poor man of the congregation received as much on the eve of the sabbath, as he needed for the following week.

II. Systematic Benevolence in the Primitive Church.

1. In the *New Testament* we have no passage, by which this Jewish system of benevolence is either expressly confirmed or abrogated. But the Saviour points out in a general way His relation to the Old Testament dispensation which may be applied also to the case in hand. He declares in the sermon of the mount, Matth. v: 17, that His mission was not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil them. The whole Mosaic law is indeed abolished in a certain sense, namely in its national and temporal form and as a killing letter, but in its spirit and essence it is confirmed, sharpened, deepened and brought to perfection by Jesus Christ, theoretically as well as practically, by His perfect doctrine and by His sinless holy life. He delivered us from the curse of the law, fulfilled it by His active and passive obedience, and gives us by his Holy Spirit and example the power to fulfil it also. Concerning the duty of charity and liberality in particular, we cannot for a moment suppose that it should have lost any of its force and extent in the N. T. dispensation, on the contrary it has increased in proportion to the increase of grace. If already the Jews, in the moon-light of the O. T. revelation, were required to manifest so much gratitude,

how much more must be expected from christians, in the midst of the full splendor of the sun of the gospel and that perfect revelation of love, which God has made in His only begotten Son? The greater the blessing bestowed upon us, the greater the gratitude required from us.

This inference from the general spirit of our holy religion is confirmed, by the actual condition of the Apostolical congregations. We find that the early christians, in the ardor of their first love and the fresh enjoyment of the unspeakable goodness of their Saviour, manifested a spirit of self-denial and benevolence, which far surpasses the Old Testament examples. The congregation of Jerusalem went so far as to introduce a voluntary community of goods; the rich members, in literal fulfilment of the commandment of Christ, Luke xii : 33, sold their possessions and laid the price at the Apostles' feet, for the benefit of the poor and suffering, Acts ii : 45, iv : 34-37. In the other congregations, where this system could not be carried out, there was at least the same spirit of self-denying love and beneficence, that true christian communism which,—without abolishing the difference of riches and poverty in a political point of view, and without destroying the variety of life according to the abstract theories and impracticable dreams of modern pseudo-reformers,—equalizes this difference from within, and makes both wealth and poverty subservient to high moral ends. The example of Tabitha, who provided for the clothing of widows and orphans with the labor of her own hand (Acts ix : 36), was certainly not isolated in the Apostolic church, but only a manifestation of its general spirit. When a famine broke out in Palestine, a. 44, all the disciples in Antioch contributed to the relief of their brethren according to their means (Acts xi : 29). The apostle Paul was especially concerned, in the midst of his many labors, to provide for his suffering fellow christians, and ordered collections to be taken up weekly in the Greek churches, for the benefit of the poor Jewish converts in Palestine, as we see from 1 Cor. xvi : 1, 2, a passage which will claim our more particular attention in the third part. He gives special praise in this respect to the christians in Macedonia, who, although comparatively poor themselves, did their utmost for the relief of their distant brethren in the faith.

We have no particular account of the way and method, by which the apostolical congregations supported their pastors and teachers. The Lord Himself, however, and St. Paul inculcates on several occasions (Matth x : 11, Luke x : 7, 8, 1 Cor. ix : 6-14, 1 Tim. v : 17, Gal. vi : 6,) the self-evident, although fre-

quently forgotten principle, that the laborer is worthy of his hire, and that the minister of the gospel is perfectly entitled to his temporal support from the congregation, to which he communicates the eternal blessings of the kingdom of heaven. By doing this, the people simply discharge a sacred duty of gratitude to God and His servants. It is very probable, yea almost certain, that the christians of Jewish descent adhered to the old custom of devoting the tithes and the first fruits to the support of religion; for as we know, they continued conscientiously to observe the whole moral and ceremonial law till the destruction of Jerusalem, without, however, imposing the same burden upon their brethren of heathen origin, (Acts xv : 28, 29). At all events, from the scattered hints of the N. Test., we must form a very high opinion of the liberality and self-denying love of the primitive churches, particularly if we take into consideration their general poverty, the many persecutions and consequent losses to which they were subjected, the numerous missionary travels of the apostles, of their delegates and co-laborers, the greater part of whom could no doubt apply to themselves the words of St. Peter: "Silver and gold have I none" (Acts iii : 6.), and who were consequently dependent upon the voluntary support of the believers.

2. If we now leave the apostolical period, and cast a glance into the succeeding age of the church, we find, in the *first three centuries* particularly, that self-denying and sacrificing love and benevolence were amongst the most prominent traits of the disciples of Jesus, and formed a most striking contrast to the cold and icy selfishness of the surrounding heathens. It is well known that the latter in the time of *Tertullian*, towards the end of the second and the beginning of the third century, used to exclaim with astonishment: "How the christians love one another, and how they are ready to die for one another!"

They did not confine, however, this love to their brethren in the faith, but, in obedience to the command of Christ (Math. v : 44,) they exercised it even towards the Pagans and Jews, who persecuted them with slander, fire and sword. In those numerous public calamities, which befell the Roman empire at that time, such as war, famine and pestilence, they took care of the poor, the sick, the prisoners and sufferers of every description, and preached by these deeds, more powerfully than by words, the divine character of their religion. When Northern Africa was visited by a destructive disease, a. 251, and when the heathens at Carthage, from fear of contagion, mercilessly threw the sick and the dying on the highways, in such numbers

that the whole city was threatened with a general infection, the noble-minded bishop *Cyprian* assembled his congregation, and exhorted them, although they had just suffered a bloody persecution, to heap coals of fire on the head of their enemies. "If we," he remarked, "do good only to our own, we do no more, than publicans and heathens; we must, as genuine christians, conquer the evil with good, love our enemies too, as our Lord exhorts us to do, and pray also for our persecutors. As we are born of God, we must, as the children of God, show ourselves worthy of this origin, by imitating our Father's goodness." This appeal was obeyed without delay. Some gave their money, others their labor, and in a short time the dead were all buried and Carthage freed from the danger of destruction. The notorious emperor, *Julian the Apostate*, who after the middle of the fourth century did his best, by all sorts of artifice, although without success, to restore the prostrate heathenism, was found with all his hatred of christianity to acknowledge this trait of benevolence in its professors, and imitated their hospitals and asylums for strangers, in order to bring his beloved idolatry into popular favor. "Let us consider," he said, "that nothing has contributed so much to the progress of the superstition of the Galileans (—thus he contemptuously called the christians—,) as their charity to the poor and to strangers. I think we ought to discharge this obligation ourselves. Establish hospitals in every place. For it is shameful that the heathens assist not even those of their own faith, while the Jews never beg, and the impious Galileans provide not only for their own poor, but also for ours, and thus help the worst cause by a commendable action." Stronger testimony could hardly be desired, than this reluctant confession of a bitter enemy.

From the earliest times, the christians in accordance with the apostolic precept (1 Cor xvi : 1–2) were in the habit of taking up *collections*, in the *weekly services*, for the benefit of the poor, the sick, the widows, the orphans and captives, every one contributing according to his ability and good will. In extraordinary cases, the bishops instituted special collections or fasts, and applied what the people saved by abstinence from food to the relief of near or distant need. The more wealthy congregations of large cities, for instance that of Rome, frequently forwarded pecuniary aid to the most remote regions, particularly for those who were persecuted on account of their faith. About the middle of the third century, Bishop *Cyprian*, with his clergy, raised in a short time over three thousand dollars, to purchase several christians of Numidia from captivity. He transmitted

the gift with an affectionate letter, from which we extract this passage: "The apostle Paul says: As many of you as are baptised, have put on Christ. Therefore we must in our captive brethren behold that Christ, who has purchased us from the danger of captivity, and redeemed us from the danger of death. We must feel constrained to free Him from the hands of the barbarians, who has delivered us from the abyss of Satan, and who now abides and dwells in us; to purchase with a small sum of money Him, who bought us by His cross and blood, and who permits this case of need to occur, in order to try our faith, and to make it appear, whether we are willing to do for others what we would wish to have done to ourselves, if we were kept in bondage by barbarians."

The payment of the *tithes*, the *first fruits* and *oblations* to the ministry, passed from the Jewish theocracy over into the christian church; at first in a free manner as a voluntary sacrifice, afterwards from the sixth century as a legal duty, the neglect of which was followed by certain ecclesiastical, and if necessary, even civil punishments. Most of the church fathers, Irenæus, Origen, Gregory of Nazianz, Chrysostom, Hilary, Augustine, Jerome and others, approve of and recommend this Old Testament institution for imitation, and assert very properly, that the christians should not fall short of the Jews, but ought rather to surpass them in liberality and piety. Ecclesiastical laws, however, requiring the payment of the tithes under punishment of excommunication, are not found before the year 585; and civil laws threatening with legal compulsion began to be introduced at a still later date, in the eighth century under Charlemagne, who himself gave the tithe of all his private possessions and of his Saxon dominions to the church. In Europe this duty of the tithe still exists either wholly or in part in several Roman Catholic and Protestant countries, particularly in England and Sweden, and is kept up by laws of the state; whilst in other countries the secular power at the time of the Reformation, and still more since the first French Revolution, has to a very considerable extent, in England under Henry VIII, in several German states, in France and in Spain, plundered the treasures of the church, heaped up by the piety of former centuries, and stopped or alienated her legal income from its original purpose. In the Oriental churches, it was and is still customary, to devote the tithe as a free gift and religious duty to sacred objects, according to Old Testament example, and in obedience to the recommendations of the early Fathers; but it was never legally introduced amongst them, yea the co-ercion of the same

by threatening with ecclesiastical punishments was even prohibited by laws.

As it regards the *administration* of legal and voluntary gifts for the cause of religion, they were in the early ages of the church distributed into four portions, under the superintendence of the bishop and his treasurer; the first portion was devoted to the bishop, the second to his clergy, the third to the poor, and the fourth to the support of the religious services and the ecclesiastical buildings. In some countries they made only three portions, and left it to the discretion of the bishop and the clergy, to provide according to circumstances for the relief of the poor, the sick, the stranger, the widows and the orphans.

It would be both interesting and instructive, to follow the history of christian charity and benevolence through the various periods of the church. There we would meet, even in the darkest centuries, particularly also in the little known and much slandered Middle Ages, splendid examples of self-denial and devotion for the cause of religion and humanity, well calculated to fill us with admiration, and to put us to shame. For the history of the church is an uninterrupted chain of proofs, that the Lord, according to His express promise, has not forsaken His people even for a single moment, but has constantly manifested Himself with the fulness of His divine-human life-powers, and expressed in His followers His own love, mercy, compassion and absolute devotion to the glory of God and the welfare of the human race. But an extensive history of benevolence would carry us far beyond the limits of a sermon or a tract, and we must therefore content ourselves, to pass over to our own condition, and enquire, how far and in what manner a regular system of benevolence, according to the instructions of the word of God and of the past history of the church, may be practised in our midst.

To be Continued.

A WORD OF EXPLANATION.

No one will expect us, we presume, to take any notice of the billingsgate expended upon us, in the last number of the Philadelphia Protestant Quarterly, edited by the Rev. Dr. Berg. Like the crackling of thorns under a pot, it has already gone its way into smoke and ashes.

We have no wish to treat with the same contempt an article, which we find directed against us in the January number of the Church Review, the respectable Quarterly of the Episcopal church published at New Haven. It shows itself to be from the hand of one who has some learning, proposes a good and fair object, and though a little rough occasionally in its manner appears to be on the whole sufficiently good natured and free from ugly bigotry and malevolence. But really it goes on such a misapprehension throughout of the drift and purpose of what we have said about the early fathers, that we find no room for honoring it with anything like a formal and regular reply. The idea of the writer seems to be, if we understand him properly, that we have been secretly proposing to stab the credit of these ancient worthies, by showing them to have been the patrons of celibacy, purgatory, veneration for relics and other such like roots and germs of the so called Roman superstition of later times. As the Jesuits in the days of Charles the First are charged with preaching Presbyterianism in England, for the purpose of bringing the cause of Protestantism into bad odor and repute, overshooting thus the *via media* of Anglicanism more out of zeal against it than for it; so in the present case, *mutatis mutandis*, it would appear that *we* are shrewdly suspected of being after all no better than a capped Puritan, out-Heroding Herod in the matter of church antiquity, only to make the *via media* suspicious again on the contrary side. Anglicanism loves antiquity; but not in too strong doses; holding the principle here, and laying down the maxim, that *too much* even of a good thing is good for nothing. The main object of our learned reviewer is, accordingly, to show in short compass the true value and proper use of the Christian Fathers, whose comfortable repose he thinks in danger of being unsettled and disturbed by the intermeddling of the Mercersburg Review. We cannot say, that the elucidation is very clear or satisfactory. We learn from it, that two extremes are to be religiously avoided; we must not make too little of the fathers, namely, like the universal school of Geneva, and we must not make too much of them, like the

church of Rome. The true happy mean between these errors of too little and too much, is exhibited to us in the better theology of the Anglican church; which having fortunately lighted on the right ecclesiastical scheme in the age of the Reformation, had nothing to do afterwards but to read this faithfully *into* the fathers, so much exactly and no more, in order to understand them as no part of the world ever understood them before.

In justice to the reviewer, it ought perhaps to be added that his strictures are based altogether on the first of our articles on Early Christianity, the second and third not having yet come under his eye. With the whole discussion before him, he could not surely have dreamed that our object was to make the fathers of no authority, by making them apparently to be of too much.

The reviewer however very magisterially charges us with rashness, in what we have said of the Romanizing tenets of the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries. Our allegations, he says, are vague and dictatorial; and we are more familiar, it is intimated, with second hand authorities, than with the *unromanized* editions of the fathers themselves. "No one knows," we are told, "what a regular trade Rome has driven in poisoning the fountains of antiquity, but those who have explored those fountains with cautious and fatiguing diligence"—a task, as this implies, which has been duly performed by our learned deponent himself. But we have seen no evidences as yet to show, that our allegations have been rash. We have found them corroborated at least by very respectable authority, in other quarters. We have not pretended at the same time to any extraordinary personal familiarity with the writings of the fathers; but neither have we felt, nor do we now feel, that this is necessary at all for any such general judgment as that which we have ventured to express; for it is so framed purposely as to take in broad and open facts only, that lie as it were on the surface of history, without depending at all on single texts or controverted readings. The doctrine of *purgatory*, our critic tells us, was not settled before the fourteenth century. And yet, we find it treated in form by Thomas Aquinas, and we know well enough besides that it was of universal force throughout the middle ages; so that it is the rashness of our very learned censor here, "considered as a scholar merely" which rather than our own deserves we think to be regarded as even more than "somewhat wonderful." But we need not come down to the middle ages. Who that has read so much only as Augustine's Confessions needs to be informed, that the practice of praying for the dead was in his time fully established? Or who can require to be told, that this

practice of itself implies the fundamental conception of purgatory, a condition after death which calls for farther *purgation* in the case of some before they can come to full rest? It may be said, that the notion of penal suffering in the case was greatly extended in later times. Be it so; that is a matter of controversy which we have purposely avoided. Our allegation regards only the general notion itself; and for the settlement of that, no great amount certainly of patristic lore or criticism is needed. It is perfectly plain that the article of purgatory, so far as the primary conception of it is concerned, was in full vogue in the days of Augustine and Chrysostom; and that the faith of that period was accordingly in full contradiction here, as well as at other points not a few, to the whole system of modern Protestantism, whether Anglican or Puritan.

Another point in regard to which the reviewer finds us blind and rash, is the *primacy* of Peter, which we are said to confound with the idea of his supremacy. On this subject, we have had some friendly expostulation also from other quarters. Let it be observed, however, that we have not pretended to fix and settle in any way the amount of jurisdiction, which belonged in the Nicene period to the see of Rome; much less to make it of one and the same order, in all respects, with the claims of the Papacy in the middle ages. Our representation has been so worded, as purposely to avoid every question of this sort, by confining itself to the most general view of the primacy, and that which must be considered as underlying the whole doctrine whether held in a higher or lower form. The amount of what we have wished to say is simply this: That the unity of the church, in the first ages, was held to be indispensable to the mystery of its existence and power—That this was taken to stand in the episcopate, as the proper succession of the Apostolical office—That such prerogative belonged to the episcopate only *in solido*, or to the episcopal college as a whole, which in the nature of the case however must have in such view its own proper centre—That the centre of the original college of the Apostles was St. Peter—That the Roman see, as the *cathedra Petri*, was distinctly acknowledged to be the seat of a similar primacy or centrality afterwards for the universal episcopate, and so we may say also for the universal church. The Epistles of Ignatius, as Professor Rothe has shown we think with overwhelming evidence, are based throughout on this theory, and show it to have been involved in the catholic idea of the church from the beginning. It comes into view plainly enough again in Irenæus and Tertullian, and also in Clement of Alexandria and Origen;

while in Cyprian it is brought out with the most explicit particularity and detail. It is not necessary here to waste time on the question, whether some one passage or so of this writer, directly asserting the primacy of the Roman see, is to be regarded as genuine or spurious; back of every such single dubious text is the universal theory and scheme of the writer, plainly requiring its own consequences, which is of far more weight than any single text separately taken; and what may be doubtful in the case of one passage, is fully made good, as Neander remarks, by the authority of another. The critical settlement of a disputed reading may be of account, for determining the relation of the older view of the ecclesiastical order now under consideration, to the view taken of it afterwards by the Roman church. But for the general fact of this order itself, which is all we have to do with here, it is of no account whatever. We have not said, that the idea of the central position of the Roman see was answerable at all points, in the Nicene period or in the time of Cyprian, to the full-blown Papacy of the middle ages. It is enough for us to know, that the unity of the church was taken to stand in the solidarity of the episcopate, and that the proper radix and matrix of the whole system, as Cyprian has it, was felt to be the *cathedra Petri*, kept up by regular succession in the church of Rome.

"Nemo fraternitatem mendacio fallat," Cyprian writes, (*De Unitate Eccl.* §. 5.) "nemo fidei veritatem perfida praevaricatione corrumpat. Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur. Ecclesia quoque una est, quae in multitudinem latius incremento foecunditatis extenditur, quemodo solis multi radii, sed lumen unum, et rami arboris multi, sed robur unum tenaci radice fundatum, et cum de fonte uno rivi plurimi defluunt, numerositas licet diffusa videatur exundantis copiae largitate, unitas tamen servatur in origine. Avelle radium solis a corpore, divisionem lucis unitas non capit; ab arbore frange ramum, fractus germinare non poterit; a fonte praecide rivum, praecisus arescit. Sic et ecclesia Domini, etc."

This we are very sure is not modern Puritanism. But neither does it suit modern Anglicanism. After all, however, it is only one phase among many of the broad difference there is, between Cyprian's Christianity and the Anglican system. The two schemes have in fact very little in common.

J. W. N.

BOOK NOTICES.

LECTURES ON THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY. *Delivered at the University of Virginia, during the Session of 1850-1.* New-York: Carters. 1852. 8vo. pp. 606.

DIVISION of labor has done much towards the triumphs and advancement of the present age; in fact it is necessary to the accomplishment of the highest results. The principle is applicable to moral and theological, as well as to mathematical and scientific investigations. The present volume is the product of division of labor. In 1850 a course of Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity was determined upon at the University of Virginia, the ancient seat of Jeffersonian infidelity. A schedule of topics was drawn up, the lecturers appointed, the lectures duly delivered, and they are now given to the reading public in a handsome and convenient form. The lecturers were the Rev. Doctors Plumer, Ruffner, McGill, Sampson, J. W. Alexander, Breckenridge, Green, Rice, and the Rev. Messrs. Van Zandt, Hoge, Moore, Miller, Smith and Robinson. The subjects embrace the vital points in the claims of Christianity, and were evidently chosen with an eye to the problems and conflicts of the present age; including the Geological, Ethnological, and Development questions. The Lectures are manifestly prepared with much care, and form a valuable contribution to American theological literature. Perhaps the circumstances which called them forth have given, at least to some of them, too much of a popular cast to be of much service in the severe scrutiny of the study. Lithograph portraits by Ritchie of all the lecturers, except Dr. Alexander, embellish the volume, and afford an interesting group for the physiognomist. The book is prefaced by a short history of the University of Virginia, by Rev. William H. Ruffner.

THE GOLDEN LEGEND. By *Henry Wadsworth Longfellow*. Boston: Ticknor, Reed and Fields. 1852. 12mo. pp. 301.

HITHERTO Longfellow has confined himself, in his poetry, principally to short effusions, characterised by lyrical sweetness and delicate sentiment, without attempting a complicated plot. The present volume partakes more of the character of a work: a steady, sustained effort, evolving dramatic and comic elements, which he has heretofore given no signs of possessing. The sub-

stratum of the poem is a legend of the Middle Ages, which has an interesting progress and a pleasurable denouement. You meet with some fine touches as you pass along, but feel at its close that the Golden Legend is not a great poem.

We notice a tendency among modern poets, strongly illustrated in this book, which we regard with anything but satisfaction. We mean a fondness for artificial and eccentric versification; often to the neglect of all rhythmical rules. It always strikes us as paltry affectation. We are far from regarding a proper succession of long and short syllables, measured accents and smooth endings, as the essentials of poetry; but we do think they cannot be entirely neglected if we would maintain the distinction between poetry and prose. C.

LECTURES ON THE LORD'S PRAYER. By *William R. Williams*. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1851. 12mo. pp. 241.

This book is from the pen of one of our favorite American authors. To our mind William R. Williams is seldom surpassed in richness of thought, beauty of imagery, felicitousness of illustration and truthful earnestness of spirit. The present subject is evidently congenial to his mind and he appears to all advantage. It is a book which one may read and feel the better for it. C.

NEANDER'S HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION AND CHURCH. Vol. IV. *Translated by Prof. Torrey*. Boston: Crocker and Brewster. 1851. 8vo. pp. 650.

THE reader of Neander will be thankful, that the labors of the indefatigable translator enable him to place the fourth volume of the author's great History beside the three previously issued. This volume brings the history down to A. D. 1294. It corresponds, in typography and binding, with the former volumes. As we placed it in our library, we involuntarily exclaimed, *clarum et venerabile nomen!* C.

ECLOGÆ EX Q. HORATII FLACCI POEMATIBUS. *Classical series edited by Drs. Schmitz and Zumpt*. Philadelphia: Blanchard and Lea. 1852.

This is one of a series of classical publications, which is winning attention and praise in all directions. The recommendations of a large number of the leading scholars and teachers of

our own country, in addition to the wide European reputation of the work, leave no room to doubt of its high excellence and worth. Its general merits indeed lie open to the most common inspection, we may say, in every volume of the series.

N.

— — —
ANCIENT HISTORY : *from the Dispersion of the Sons of Noe, to the Battle of Actium and change of the Roman Republic into an Empire.* By PETER FREDET, D. D., Professor of History in St. Mary's College, Baltimore. Second Edition, revised, enlarged and improved. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1851. Pp. 490.

MODERN HISTORY : *from the coming of Christ, and the change of the Roman Republic into an Empire, to the Year of our Lord 1850.* By PETER FREDET, D. D., Prof. &c. Fifth Edition, enlarged and improved. Baltimore: J. Murphy & Co. 1851. Pp. 552.

The second of these volumes is older than the first, though it comes after it in plan. They are now published together, the two volumes in connection presenting a complete history of the civilized world throughout the whole duration of its existence, from the creation down to the present time, a space of 5850 years. Much care and labor seem to have been bestowed upon the entire work. It is written in clear, chaste style, gives evidence of extensive reading, and forms altogether a well digested compend of universal history. The repeated editions through which it is passing, are a decided proof of its popularity.

N.

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

MAY, 1852.

VOL. IV.—NO. III.

SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE.¹

Lev. xxvii: 30—~~32~~—Ex. xxx: 13—16—1 Cor. xvi: 1—2—
Act. xx: 35.

Conclusion.

III. Systematic Benevolence in America.

IN the United States of North America, Church and State, as is known, are separated from each other, similarly as in the first three centuries, until Constantine the Great; with this important difference, however, that at that time the State, which was most intimately connected with heathen idolatry, did not at all legally acknowledge the Church, and even bloodily persecuted her, whilst with us both powers exist peaceably side by side of each other, and at least indirectly give to each other mutual protection. For on the one hand our religious corporations en-

¹ A Sermon preached by appointment before the Synod of the German Reformed Church of the U. S., at Lancaster, Pa., on the 20th of October, 1851, and published by request of the Synod.

joy the protection of the civil law, as it regards person and property, and on the other hand, christianity evidently forms the moral basis and support of our republic, without which it must in a short time be dissolved in complete anarchy. We may lament indeed the religious indifferentism of our State-constitutions, so far as they are the product of the wide-spread infidelity of the last century, and cannot in any way regard the abstract separation as the normal and ultimate condition, which requires rather a harmonious union of religion and morality and the absolute, though free dominion of the christian principle over all the faculties and relations of the individual and national life, or in one word a theocracy, where God shall be all in all, and where Christ shall rule king amongst the nations as He ruleth now king in the church. Still we infinitely prefer the separation and independent position of the secular and spiritual powers, to an absolute hierarchy on the one side, and to the Erastian principle on the other, and that intermeddling of the State with the internal concerns of the church, which we find in most of the Protestant establishments or State-churches of Europe, to the injury of religion and piety ; and we have every reason to be thankful to God, that the church here enjoys perfect freedom, and can discharge independently and without interruption all her own peculiar functions. For it is not seemly, that the free-born daughter of heaven, the royal Bride of the God-man and the World-Saviour, should be degraded to the maid-servant of earthly power and its temporal interests. The less the church is restricted in the possession and exercise of her innate rights, the more beneficially will she also operate upon civil society ; the more she is honored as the servant of Christ, as an immediately divine institution for the salvation of the world, so much the more will she prove herself in the noblest sense, the servant of the people, as Christ Himself, the Lord of heaven, served us in His own free love and offered Himself up for us even unto death.

A natural result of this relation of peaceful neutrality between religion and politics, between Church and State in our country, and that unlimited freedom of conscience necessarily connected with it, is what is called the *voluntary* system in the support of religion. Here the church must everywhere alone take care of all her concerns, and provide for herself the necessary pecuniary means for the exercise of her duties and the attainment of her benevolent objects. She has indeed by all means the right to require from her members certain contributions for her support, and is in solemn duty bound, to present them earnestly to their

hearts and consciences, as an essential exercise of piety. But she can compel no person externally by co-ercive measures to these contributions, as the State may in collecting its taxes ; on the contrary she is permitted to employ only spiritual motives, that may be applied to the conscience and the free will. For she is not a legal institution, that has its ground in a physical necessity and its end in the temporal welfare of society, as the civil commonwealth, but a moral religious community, founded upon the gospel for the spread of the glory of God, and the eternal happiness of man. She could indeed here call to her assistance the laws of the State in enforcing the payment of formal obligations and subscriptions, that have been once given her ; but in doing so she would violate her own nature, sacrifice her dignity, and lose her influence among the people. The only penalties, which are at the command of the church as such, are of a moral character, namely, first private, then public admonition, and in extreme cases, exclusion from the enjoyment of the means of grace, until repentance takes place. Corporeal punishments, however, and the deprivation of civil rights proceed only from the political authority, and therefore cannot be admitted for the violation of religious duties, where the State and Church are separated from each other, except in the few cases, where the former has a common interest with the latter, as is for instance the case with us in the observation of the sabbath and monogamy.

Now this state of things has the disadvantage, that the maintenance of the church and her officers is rendered more burdensome, and the contributions of those, to a great extent, taken away, who do not stand with her in any internal connection, although they enjoy the outward blessings of christian civilization and are therefore under obligations to her. But on the other hand, the voluntary system is nevertheless in perfect harmony with the evangelical nature of the church and calls forth an amount of individual christian benevolence and sacrifice, which then again exerts a salutary influence upon other departments of the religious life. A most brilliant proof of this was furnished lately to the world by the "*Free Church of Scotland*," which, since its secession from the established church (1843,) has been thrown upon the voluntary system, and raised, in the last eight years with its eight hundred congregations, over twelve millions of dollars for ecclesiastical objects. Her contributions for missions have more than doubled those of the much more wealthy church of the State. With us too indeed the good effects of this system outweigh the many and sometimes highly

vexatious grievances, which are certainly brought upon the church by the management of her own pecuniary concerns. We should not therefore permit ourselves to be discouraged by the difficulties growing out of this condition, nor lust after the flesh-pots of a wealthy State-church, governed and paid with military precision; rather we should labor with all the moral and religious means at our command, to awaken in our congregations the proper spirit of christian love and liberality. When this *spirit* is once there, then will also gifts come in of themselves regularly and to the desired amount. But we dare never lose sight of our peculiar relations, nor go any further in our ecclesiastical legislation, than the conviction and good will of our congregations admit. In the present condition of our German people, particularly of the foreign Germans, who were accustomed in Europe to see the governments provide for all the necessities of the church, the first steps in this matter must be gentle and cautious, otherwise the nonsensical cry of priest-craft and tyranny of conscience will at once be raised. To make laws, which cannot be carried out, is very unwise, and can only serve, to undermine the respect for law and authority itself.

From this point of view, we desire the following suggestions to be considered. They are indeed mere suggestions, which we do not wish to be followed any further than present circumstances seem to make it advisable, and which may be subjected to considerable modifications by a more enlightened and experienced judgment.

We now enter upon the particular objects, for whose support a well-established religious community should feel concerned. We may divide them into three classes: 1. *Congregational worship*. 2. The *general* institutions and operations of the church. 3. The *poor*.

a. The Maintenance of Congregational Worship.

The maintenance of congregational worship includes the support of the pastor, the erection, preservation and repair of the church-building, the providing of sacred furniture, the care of the education of the young, in short, everything that pertains to the prosperity of the single local congregation. Here beneficence can be most demanded, and here it will be also exercised much more generally and to a greater extent, than for other purposes, as this object lies nearest to the individual and recommends itself at once to his attention.

1. The *salary of the minister* should be neither too high, nor too low, but just so large, as is necessary to secure for him a decent subsistence, one that will correspond with his station, as well as the social character of his people, and enable him at the same time, to set a good example of charity to the poor and to incite his flock to imitation. Wealth, as a rule, of which, however, there are always and everywhere honorable exceptions, is more injurious, than advantageous to the clerical rank, produces easily worldliness and cripples energy of action; if in addition covetousness and avarice are associated with it, they ruin the moral influence of the minister almost entirely and bring him into contempt. The opposite extreme of real poverty involves him, who should devote his time and strength entirely to the service of the word and the altar, in secular care, cuts him off from the means of the further improvement of his mind, to his own injury as well as to that of the congregation, and discourages him in the fulfilment of his duty. Here the maxim in the full sense is valid: "Mittelmaas ist die beste Strass," a medium is best. If in this respect we compare our congregations with some other churches, we may well recommend to them a greater degree of liberality. The ministers, in the Lutheran as well as in the Reformed Church, receive on an average a much smaller salary, than the clergy of the leading English denominations in congregations of similar means, and yet they have officially perhaps twice as much to attend to, owing to the wide extent of their charges and the frequent necessity of officiating in two languages. Would that our laity might reflect, that it is before God and the world their shame, that they often permit their spiritual shepherds to suffer for want. In the minister, the congregation honors itself, and in him it despises itself.

2. As it regards the erection and improvement of *buildings* for the exclusive use of divine services, they are indeed not absolutely necessary, as times of persecution and most missionary stations prove, for we can everywhere worship the omnipresent God in spirit and in truth. Nevertheless they are very important for the orderly continuance of a congregation, and they will therefore be erected, where circumstances admit, as in the case of the synagogues and the temple among the Jews, and according also to the general custom of the christian Church. In our land great activity has been manifested in reference to the erection of houses of worship, and for several years past a more refined taste for church-architecture has been almost generally awakened, even in those denominations, that originally proceeded from the principle of the greatest simplicity in divine service, and rejected steeples,

bells and organs entirely. Not only Roman Catholics and Episcopalians, but also Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists and Methodists have begun to erect splendid and costly churches, though not seldom in singular misconception of style, or in striking contradiction between the outside and their internal arrangement. Many of our Protestant churches resemble theatres, or heathen temples of idolatry much more, than christian houses of God, whilst others are externally Gothic, i. e., medieval and catholic, but internally modern and puritanic; and have, instead of an altar, which in earlier times was looked upon as the indispensable sanctissimum, a pompous, theatrical stage for the spiritual "orator," who then makes an unnecessary and unbecoming parade and entirely absorbs the liturgus and the priest. As a general thing in our modern church-structures there is perhaps too much regard paid to fashion, secular ornament and personal comfort, while the idea of solemnity, and what tends to elevate the soul and to fill it with religious impressions, is overlooked. Many churches in our cities are almost like a fashionable parlour, which would probably rouse the indignation of Farel and John Knox, as much as once did the altars and images of Popery. The church is the house of worship, and to be a real work of art, it should indeed by its whole appearance and structure raise us from earth to heaven, and awaken in us the feeling: "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground; this is the house of God; here is the gate of heaven."

But irrespective of such mongrel forms, in which the contradiction between modern fashion, and the traditional theology, the disharmony of the style of architecture with the idea of divine service, comes to light, in general we cannot but approve of the awakened predilection for beautiful churches, and we rejoice in every advance, which is made among us in this respect. If we build fine houses for ourselves, why not much more so for God? The best belongs to the Lord. Many indeed think, that money would be much better applied, if it were given to the poor, instead of erecting with it a dead heap of stones. So also thought Judas, the traitor, when Mary anointed the Saviour's feet with costly oil of spikenard, and concealed under this hypocritical sympathy for the poor only his own filthy avarice! The one should be done, and the other not left undone. A majestic house of worship is as it were a visible sermon, which points every attentive looker-on from earth to heaven, from the temporal to the eternal, and speaks to him in silent eloquence of the prayers and the acts of self-sacrificing love and

piety, which has heaped up stone upon stone to the honor of the Lord, and to the advancement of the devotion of His assembled people. A single Gothic dome with its spires, like so many hands pointing towards the heavenly Jerusalem, with the mysterious light and shade of its stained glass, with its majestic arches, its solemn silence, its stirring chime of bells, has from year to year, from generation to generation, from century to century, like the temple once at Jerusalem, banished innumerable worldly thoughts, animated to works of charity, and brought sinners to hesitate, and reflect upon the condition of their souls.

3. Finally to the complete prosperity of a christian congregation, belongs also a *school*; and here a new field is opened for our benevolence, upon which we can only cursorily touch. It was a beautiful custom of our fore-fathers, that they erected beside the church also a school-house, and next to the preacher of the gospel they looked about for a teacher. The church and the school are most closely connected together. The church is the mother of all popular education, and the school ought to be the nursery of the church, so that we can say: *from the house into the school, from the school into the church, from the church into heaven.* It is only when both go together hand in hand, that either can fully meet its object.

At the present time, it is true, the civilization of Europe and America, which is entirely the fruit of Christianity, has to a very considerable extent ungratefully separated itself from its maternal soil, the church, and among us a system of public schools has been erected, that stands exclusively under the supervision of the state and is, like the state itself, indifferent to religion or at least to all positive creeds. We would not deny that this arrangement may serve to awaken the slumbering faculties of the mind of our nation, and in this respect effect much good. But here if the church does not in some supplementary way interfere, we are fearful that our public schools may educate an unbelieving generation, and that the blessing of culture may be converted into a curse. For that culture only is a blessing to a people, which rests upon a sound moral and religious basis, and keeps in view the eternal interests of the immortal spirit. "Education," says a late writer on this subject in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct., 1851, p. 763, "education unbaptized and unimpregnated with the christian spirit, is not only partial and defective, it is often positively pernicious. It is a curse instead of a blessing. It is an actual training for crime, a laborious providing of dangers for the community, a conferring of power, with the positive certainty of its abuse. It disciplines the evil passions of our

nature, makes men wicked by rule, reduces vice to a system, and subjects the clear head and the strong arm to the impulse of the bad heart. The mildew of a cultivated but depraved mind, blights whatever it falls upon. It sears the souls of men. No human imagination can set bounds to the evil, either in space or duration. Through the agency of the press, it reaches other times and far distant ages." It is true we have Sunday Schools, which seek to compensate for the want of religious instruction in our elementary schools, and they truly deserve in a high degree the sympathy and active assistance of every christian and philanthropist. Yet it may with reason be doubted, whether they entirely meet the wants of the case, and whether they are capable of preventing permanently the injury referred to above. It appears to us, that the establishment of a regular system of *parochial* schools, alone can meet the pressing want, and they therefore should claim the attention of all the friends of a genuine intellectual, and at the same time moral and religious education of the people. It is high time for our classes and synods to think about it, before the waves of the unbelieving spirit of the age break over our heads, and scorn the voice of the church. Single efforts of the kind have been made already in several congregations, and have given full proofs of their importance and usefulness. Moreover if the church would sustain good schools, she must also be concerned about good school *teachers*, and also a good institution, where they may be regularly prepared for their important calling. Our public schools are to some extent precisely on this account in such a truly miserable condition, because most of the states have not at all thought of founding normal schools, and seminaries for school-teachers, and consequently have entrusted their youth to such, as have often need themselves first to learn the elements. The church could bring into existence such an institution for the education of school-teachers most easily, and with the least expense, in connection with the already existing colleges.

Still the church dare not stop here. She is not to rest satisfied with the elementary education, which should be made accessible to all persons without exception, but to urge forward also those who have talent and inclination for wider cultivation, to the higher and highest grades of mental improvement. She is, according to the testimony of history, the mother not only of popular schools, but also of colleges and universities. It therefore pertains to a complete system of education, that every ecclesiastical district, whether it be called Classis or Synod, should establish and sustain a classical Preparatory school, or as we say

in this country, an Academy; and every denomination according to its extent and wants, one or more Gymnasias or Colleges; and where circumstances permit and make it advisable even a University with all the four faculties, where the most gifted youth may be educated for the various professions. This, however, already leads us beyond the horizon of congregational wants, and it can therefore be but cursorily referred to. We will only add, that if the church wishes to do her whole duty, advance with the times in the best sense of the term, and exert a salutary influence upon the nation in every direction, she must with all her energy lay hold of the great subject of education, the cultivation of the mind and the heart, in all its grades and forms, and consecrate and sanctify it with the spirit of the gospel. Knowledge is power, and without it no denomination can expect to prosper permanently. It is among the most encouraging and hopeful facts in the history of the German Reformed and Lutheran churches in America, that zeal for education after a long slumber has in more recent times made powerful strides among them, as their academies, colleges and seminaries alone are sufficient to show, which, have sprung into existence, within the last twenty or thirty years.

4. But now the question arises, how shall the necessary means for the different branches of congregational religion be procured. Here we recommend according to the pattern of the Old Testament and of the ancient church, the giving of the *tenth*, as a *free-will offering*, which from an inward impulse and with a joyful heart, may be presented to our Lord and Saviour. This arrangement originates from the all-wise God himself, and therefore needs not human recommendation and justification. It moreover commends itself also to rational reflection. It does not require from the wealthy too little, nor from the poor too much, but from each precisely in proportion to his ability, and exacts from him, who is entirely without income, no contribution at all. It would indeed be difficult to hit upon a better arrangement, than this, which proceeded from God Himself, and which has been approved and practised more or less by the christian church at all times.

But now the circumstances referred to above, in which we are placed, do not by any means permit us to make the tithe, a legal duty, and to impose it upon our congregations as a tax under threat of church discipline. This especially among our Germans would be impracticable and have the most injurious results. In this respect we dare not go further than the church in the first centuries, which indeed looked upon the tithe as binding

upon christians also, but left the actual payment of the same to the free-will of individuals. For formal laws of the church respecting it, as said above, are not found before the sixth century, and state-laws not before the eighth. All that we can do in the matter under present circumstances, is to recommend it as a gift well pleasing in the sight of God. We must make ourselves and our people familiar with the thought, that at least the tenth part of our income belongs to the Lord, from whom the blessing upon our labors proceeds, and should be expended in the promotion of His kingdom upon earth, and that we, instead of yielding to the Jews in piety and benevolence, should rather surpass them, in the same degree, in which the glory of the new covenant outshines that of the old. This obligation we may recommend even to those who are not communicant members of the church. For if they do not immediately enjoy the spiritual blessings of the same, to their own great injury, they nevertheless derive all kinds of inestimable temporal advantages from her, and the permanence and prosperity of the church is of even still greater importance for the security of their person and property, for the interest of their children and children's children, than the permanence and welfare of the State, which without the direct or the indirect influence of religion and morality, could not prosper, sustain the authority of its laws, nor least of all enjoy the blessings of freedom. As thou renderest unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, so from these lower considerations, if not from higher religious motives, thou shouldst render unto God the things that are God's.

O, if we christians, we children of God, and heirs of eternal life, properly appreciated the innumerable favors and blessings which we daily and hourly enjoy at the hands of our heavenly father, if true thankfulness and reciprocal love for His infinite love, inflamed our hearts, we would cheerfully give Him and His church, not only the tenth, but as much of our income as we could in any way spare; yea, those examples of former times, which at present alas! have almost entirely become extinct, would then return in abundance, when wealthy youth and men, virgins and widows, in literal fulfilment of the Saviour's word, Matth. xix: 21, sold all their goods, devoted them to benevolent objects, and taking upon themselves their cross, followed the Lord in voluntary poverty, who when He was upon earth had no where to lay His head, and became poor that He might make us rich.

That the contribution of the tenth, if it were practised only by the greater part of christians, would suffice for all the wants

of congregational services, and the education of the young, does not well admit of a doubt in the wealthy condition of our land. Indeed there would be an important surplus remaining, which then according to the best individual judgment might be allotted to other benevolent objects, or handed over into the general treasury of the church, to be expended especially for the support of needy missionary stations. In the Free Church of Scotland, according to the proposition of the late Dr. Chalmers, the congregational contributions flow together into a general treasury of the church for the support of the ministers, from which then an equal part (150 £) is paid to each of them, in addition to what they may directly receive from their parishioners in the way of presents in proportion to their means and liberality. This plan, however, at least so far as it regards the contemplated amount of 150£ or about \$660, has not been fully realized yet, and Dr. Chalmers shortly before his death had given up the principle of the *equal* distribution of the minister's fund, and recommended to the church a change in this respect, which will probably be made by the Assembly at some future time. In our relations, this system, however much may be said in its favor, could not be introduced, except in the case of our missionary stations, and we must therefore leave to each congregation the independent management of its own pecuniary matters.

5. In addition to the tenth, the Jews, as we have seen above, were accustomed to give to the priests a part of the *first fruits*. This model gave rise, already in the early times of the church, to the custom of presenting the minister occasionally, besides his fixed support, with free will offerings of money or produce. We consider this practice as praiseworthy in itself, and as well calculated to encourage the pastor, and to fasten more firmly the tie between him and his flock. The surplice fees, however, (*jura stolae* or *stola*, in opposition to the *jura altaris*) or regular perquisites, i. e. the obligatory pay for official acts such as baptisms, confirmations, funerals, as also the so-called confessor's fee, were unknown to christian antiquity, or directly forbidden as a species of simony (Acts viii: 18,) and came into vogue at a later period in the Greek and Roman churches, and were transplanted from these into most Protestant churches. They certainly present the danger of giving to sacred functions, a trade-like and mercenary appearance, and thereby are apt to degrade the clerical office in the eyes of the people. We cannot therefore in any way regret the abrogation of this custom in the most of our English congregations, but must at the same time maintain, that

in our European German congregations a sudden change in this respect would be imprudent, and therefore not advisable.

b. The support of the general Institutions and Operations of the Church.

The second subject of christian benevolence, are *the general institutions and operations of the church*. Among these we regard the *Theological Seminary*, the *Education* of gifted and pious young men for the holy ministry, *Domestic* and *Foreign Missions*.

We are not only members of a single congregation but of a confession or denomination, and through these at the same time members of the whole christian church, and we should therefore take the most lively and active part in their benevolent establishments and operations. He who interests himself merely for his own local congregation, has no conception at all of the christian church, of that communion of saints, which embraces every land and time, yea, heaven and earth; and also ignores entirely the welfare of his own particular congregation. For as the single member in the body can increase and prosper only, when the whole body is healthy, so it holds in our case. The weal and the wo, the honor and the shame, the bloom and the decline of a denomination, and of single congregations, go hand in hand. Usually, therefore, they who take no interest in the general matters and institutions of the church, are also the most negligent members of the congregation, and the reverse. Individual or personal piety must necessarily enlarge itself into congregational; congregational into denominational, or confessional; denominational, that it may not degenerate into sectarianism or party spirit, into churchly, or in a good sense, catholic piety, so as to sympathize with the entire body of Christ in all countries and times.

The object of the church of Christ in general, as also of her particular branches, or confessions, is the same as that of the incarnation of the Son of God, namely, the redemption of the world from sin and misery, the regeneration, the conversion, the sanctification, and the perfection of the whole human race, until God shall be all in all. This exalted end can be reached only through the divinely appointed means of grace, i. e. especially the preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments. This again cannot be done without living organs, to whom the office of the word and altar as a duty belongs. "How

shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard? How shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent?" (Rom. x : 14, 15.) As now further every calling, but especially so difficult and responsible an office, as that of the ministry of reconciliation, requires diligent preparation, and as further in all times, a great, if not the greatest part of the clergy, have proceeded from the lower and poorer ranks of society ; it follows that the church, to reach that object, must have a care for the education of pious and promising young men for the ministerial office, that they may on the one hand preserve Christianity in congregations already established, and on the other hand carry the word of God into the domestic and foreign missionary fields to the most distant heathen. A well-grounded education for the ministerial office, requires however further a regular Theological School ; and this again presupposes other schools, where elementary knowledge, the arts and sciences generally, without which theology is destitute of the necessary ground-work, shall be taught. From this appears the close, inseparable connection, in which the four above mentioned general operations of the church stand. *Foreign* missions can never flourish, without *Domestic* missions and a living zeal in the midst of Christendom itself. But whence shall the missionaries come, the ministers and shepherds for abroad and at home, if the church has no concern for their *Education* ; and how shall these ministers instruct others in the word of God, if they have never enjoyed proper instruction in it themselves! And where can this necessary knowledge be obtained more readily, safely, and thoroughly, than in a *Theological Seminary*? We may therefore regard all these four branches of benevolence, as essentially one and the same interest, and also embrace their support from the same point of view.

The question now arises, what is the best method for this support, that the church may grow internally, supply itself constantly with an able after-growth of ministers, and at the same time extend ever wider and wider the boundaries of the kingdom of Jesus Christ with its innumerable blessings. For this the support of the Israelitish temple may serve us as a model. As already remarked, according to divine appointment, every Jew from twenty years and upwards, without distinction of rank and property, was obliged to contribute yearly a half shekel, or two drachms, i. e. in our currency about thirty cents, for the maintenance of the general national sanctuary, which was at first the tabernacle, and afterwards the temple at Jerusalem. "The rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less

than half a shekel, when they give an offering unto the Lord to make an atonement for your souls" (Exodus xxx : 13-16 ; 2 Chron. xxiv : 6). The Saviour himself with his disciples was accustomed to pay this tribute, although He, as the Son of God, and Lord of the temple, was free from this obligation (Matth. xvii : 26-27).

If now the Jews under the imperfect revelation of the Old Testament, and at a time, when the value of money was much higher than at present, contributed, in addition to the tithe, the first fruits, and the free will gifts to the poor, also yearly thirty cents for the maintenance of the common centre of divine worship : should not we, under the more perfect revelation of the New Testament, in the enjoyment of the innumerable benefits of the gospel, in a rich, free and happy land, be cheerfully prepared to contribute, the relatively smaller amount of at least fifty cents yearly for all the general objects of the church, to which we belong ? At present the burden of supporting our Seminary, our Educational and Missionary interests, falls upon a small part of our members, while hundreds and thousands give themselves no concern about them at all. By the introduction, however, and the carrying out of a general rule, this inequality would be adjusted, from no one would too much be required, and yet on the whole much more would come in than at present. The number of communicant members in the Reformed church is estimated at 80,000 at least. If every one would throw into the general treasury of the church at least half a dollar a year, we should obtain \$40,000, with which we might in a short time firmly endow our Literary Institutions, double and treble our missionary operations, and at the same time educate for the gospel ministry a much greater number of pious young men, than is alas ! at present the case. In the Lutheran church, which, numerically considered, according to the statistical reports, is at least twice as strong, the income of course would be twice as much. We would, however, to be safe, at first propose only twenty five cents as an average contribution from each member, leaving it of course free to each, to give more if he is able and willing. Even in this case, much more would come into the general treasury of the church, than as yet has been the case either among Lutherans, or Reformed, or the German Evangelical associations, and our general objects of benevolence, could without any difficulty be sustained.

The most convenient time to pay over these contributions to the minister, or the consistory would be on the Sundays, upon which the Holy Communion is administered, which in our con-

gregations usually takes place four times a year. In order, however, to make this system definite, and to give it the necessary regularity and promptitude, it would be necessary, to appoint a *General Treasurer* of the church, whose business it would be to see, that the contributions be punctually paid over to him by the ministers, and that then the monies thus coming in be devoted to the four branches of the general activity of the church, according to the necessities of each, under the supervision of the Synod, or a Synodical committee with proper security.

Should this proposal of a *yearly contribution of not less than twenty five cents for every communicating member*, not meet with approbation, we then know of no better plan to propose, than to appoint *yearly collections* for each of the four above mentioned objects of benevolence, without specifying any definite amount; a plan which has already often been recommended by Synod, and also partially carried out, but never so regularly and universally, as we could wish. For these collections communion seasons and especially the days of the harvest-sermon would suit best.

c. *The Support of the Poor.*

The third object of christian benevolence is the care of the *poor* and the *distressed*. "The poor ye have always with you," says the Saviour. God permits the difference of property in human society to continue, partly in order to exercise the poor in humility, in contentment, in thankfulness, in freedom from envy, and to raise their minds from earth to heaven and to the imperishable treasures of the kingdom of God, which are always accessible to them; partly to give the rich a constant opportunity for the exercise of love and benevolence. The Holy Scriptures are full of injunctions to this virtue, and annex to it the most precious promises. "He that hath pity upon the poor, lendeth unto the Lord, and that which he hath given, will he repay him again," says already the Old Testament; and the Saviour promises to reward richly in the great day of account even a drink of water, given to the thirsty. Hence the church at all times has interested herself with peculiar affection and concern in the poor, the sick and the destitute of every description. The proofs thereof are the numberless asylums for the poor, for widows and orphans, for the sick and for strangers, and similar benevolent institutions, by which christian lands and

nations have distinguished themselves so favorably above the territories of heathenism.

In this department of benevolence, a rival of the church has grown up in the numerous *secret societies*, which of late have increased powerfully, and not without the fault of the church itself, which has partly neglected her duty and obligation, or only half discharged it. We do not mean in this to condemn these associations in and of themselves, as little as the public schools. In their own way they may be very commendable and useful, and may contribute to the promotion of certain virtues, provided they do not pass beyond their sphere and put themselves in the place of the church and positive Christianity, as it seems to be the tendency at least of some of them to do. In the last case, their blessing would as certainly be turned into a curse, as the public schools must operate perniciously, so soon as they rise up in a hostile attitude towards religion, and promote infidelity. But irrespective of these possible dangers and consequences, we must in the first place deny, that secret societies are of a *benevolent* character, in the strict sense of the term, although they are usually represented as such. They are much more at bottom mutual insurance-companies, whose members in case of sickness receive pay for services rendered, namely the interest for their weekly or monthly contributions, and are of course held together by the principle of self-preservation and self-interest. Beyond the circle of contributing members and their families, the charity of these associations does not at all extend, and therefore they can never take the place of the church. For the gifts of christian love and charity are free and unmerited, and are extended for the most part directly to those, who are excluded from the benefit of those societies, for the reason of their inability to fulfil the necessary pecuniary conditions. Nay, where the mitigation of plain bodily necessity is concerned, love does not stop first to ascertain the amount of moral desert, although the mode and manner of its relief are indeed governed by a wise regard to the character of the subject. It resembles the good Samaritan, who forgetting his national hatred, had compassion on the Jew that had fallen among murderers, and took care of him with the utmost devotion, whilst the Priest and the Levite passed by him with cold indifference. It imitates its author, God Himself, who maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust.—But then it is not satisfied with the removal of mere bodily want: this is to be rather only the bridge to a higher moral and religious labor of love. For Providence sends poverty and sickness, to turn

our attention to our internal miseries, to the much greater want of our souls, and to lead us to true spiritual riches, to the possession of the treasures, which neither moth nor rust can corrupt. This pedagogic end of evil, however, no society can reach, but the Christian Church, which God Himself has established, and to which alone, He has promised everlasting duration.

Hence it is the sacred duty of every individual congregation, which professes the Lord Jesus Christ, the great physician of body and soul, to take care of the poor and destitute, especially in their own midst, with self-denying and self-sacrificing love. It were a horrible disgrace, if the church should be willing to leave this work to the state, or to philanthropic societies, which cannot carry it out in the right way, nor with proper success.

In what way now shall this duty be exercised by each congregation in a systematic manner? We have upon this the fruitful suggestion of the apostle Paul, who made the regulation in the churches of Asia Minor and Greece, that every member on the first day of the week, i. e., on Sunday should, according to the measure of his income, lay by him in store, a contribution for the poor in Palestine, that there might be no gatherings when he came, (1 Cor. xvi : 1-2). From this we see : 1. That the contributions for the poor should take place regularly *every week*, especially on every *Sunday*, when we forget earthly cares and are reminded by the preaching of the gospel of the numberless blessings of God, and stimulated to every good work. 2. That the duty of giving is *general*, and therefore extends not only to the wealthy, but also to all who have any thing to spare, however little it may be. The Macedonian Christians were precisely on this account praised by the apostle Paul, because they themselves notwithstanding their great poverty, contributed above their ability to that fair work of love, (2 Cor. viii : 1ff). It is the duty of every believer to pray, and so also to exercise love and to do good according to his ability. 3. That the amount of benevolent contributions is to be determined by the *ability*. Every one should give conscientiously, in proportion to his profit and to the temporal blessing bestowed upon him by God, remembering, that he must at one time before the everlasting judgment seat render an account, as for every word, that he has spoken, (Matth. xii : 34) so also for every cent which he receives. He who cannot give more, let him extend at least his mite, like the poor widow, who will be praised on that account, as long as the gospel resounds. "If thou hast abundance, give alms accordingly ; if thou hast but a little, be not afraid to give according to that little," Tobit iv : 9. To whom much has

VOL. IV.—NO. III. 15 •

been given, of him also will much be required, and to whom little has been given, of him little will be required.

In most of our congregations, especially in the European German, it is a beautiful ancient custom, on every Sunday after divine worship to take up a cent collection. This was originally designed for the poor, and doubtless took its rise out of that apostolic ordinance; in many cases, however, it has been alienated from this object, and applied to the paying of the minister, and the necessary expenses of divine worship. Let us provide for these wants in some other way, return to that old christian custom, and with earnestness and zeal discharge our sacred obligations to the poor.

The proper managers of the alms of every congregation are the *Deacons* under the supervision of the minister and the elders. According to their original appointment, they were the overseers of the sick and the poor, as we learn from the sixth chapter of the Acts and from the subsequent history of the church. Our deacons for the most part alas! have become estranged from this duty, and there is hardly a shadow thereof remaining. This is a foul stain upon our church-organization, that should claim our most earnest consideration. We have no good reason to pride ourselves upon the apostolic character of our government, so long as our Deacons confine themselves to the business of carrying around on the Sabbath the purse, and of collecting the salary of the minister. For that purpose, the apostles would hardly have instituted a particular office in the church with a solemn ordination and installation.

Corresponding to the office of Deacons in the apostolic church, and onwards until in the thirteenth century, was the office of *Deaconesses* for poor and sick females of the congregation. Thus Paul mentions the deaconess Phoebe in Cenchrea with praise, (Rom. xvi: 1). Females have received particular gifts from the Lord, which should be organized and employed for the benefit of the church. It would therefore be of importance to revive that office; and to maintain thus an evangelical counter-part to the Roman Catholic institution of *Sisters of Charity*, founded A. D., 1634 by Vincent of Paul, which has already dried up innumerable tears, healing the wounds and soothing the pains of both body and soul. Yea, why should not every ecclesiastical district have an Asylum for the poor, the sick, orphans, and widows, where together with bodily help the comfort of eternal life might be imparted to the suffering. The restoration of the office of Deacons to its original significance, the revival of the similar office of Deaconesses and of the whole

ecclesiastical care of the sick and the poor, would render secret societies unnecessary, or at all events entirely harmless to the church, and remove the reproach, that she neglected works of charity, which Christ and His apostles impressed so urgently upon her, and which she in past times so abundantly practised. As truly as we are justified according to Paul by faith in the Saviour, so firmly on the other hand stands the word of James: "Faith without works is dead."

If now we comprise in a few words the result of this discussion, we would recommend: 1. In general sustained by the example of the Old Testament and of the first centuries of the christian church, the consecration of the one tenth part of our income—yet not as a legal requirement, but as a free-will offering—for religious and benevolent objects primarily in our own neighborhood, and then for the kingdom of God at large; 2. A special yearly contribution of not less than twenty-five cents for the general institutions and operations of our denomination, according to the Old Testament model of supporting the national sanctuary, Ex. xxx: 13–16; 3. A collection on every Sabbath for the benefit of the poor and the destitute, according to the apostolic direction, 1 Cor. xvi: 1–2, in connection with the revivification of the office of Deacons and Deaconesses. As it regards the application and distribution of the tenth to the different objects of divine worship, and the general activity of the church, as also with regard to the amount of contribution to the poor, every one must take counsel with his conscience, and act according to his means and his best judgment, remembering the account which he owes to God for all His gifts and benefits, and their faithful use.

In conclusion, we add a few *practical* remarks which every reader may carry out further for himself.

1. It is high time, for the German Churches in America to free themselves of the charge of penuriousness and covetousness, which hitherto has been attributed to them, and to emulate with all their strength the leading English denominations in the virtue of benevolence and liberality in the spread of the kingdom of God at home and abroad. Of course there are many, who are very liberal and yet strangers to the life of God and full of Pharisaic hypocrisy; but it is impossible that true piety should exist together with hard-heartedness and covetousness, which in the Holy Scripture is called a root of all evil. Economy is a virtue, for which the Germans especially are distinguished, but

covetousness is a vice, one of the most hateful forms of selfishness, by which man becomes at last as cold and heartless, as the stone and metal, on which he has set his affections. The example of the Moravian Society, which is almost entirely German, and has accomplished more comparatively for heathen missions than any other denomination, as also of the liberality of single individuals in almost all the German Churches, prove satisfactorily, of what devotion and self-sacrifice in this department the German is capable, when he is once properly inflamed with the fire of divine love, and awakened to a consciousness of his sacred duty. Then he also is known to give out of a full heart and out of pure love to God and man, and only such a giver is acceptable to the Lord.

2. Let us reflect, that liberality for the holy cause of truth, virtue and godliness has never as yet brought any person to beggary, but according to the express promise of the infallible God, will even in time be blessed. When the Jews, under the old covenant, conscientiously paid their tithes and other contributions, they were prosperous, and had abundance; when they withheld from the Lord the gifts that belonged to Him, they only robbed themselves, and had to repent of it bitterly. At the present day, precisely the most liberal nations, as the English and the Scotch, are the most blessed with earthly prosperity, and it would be a very superficial view, if we should derive this last from their flourishing trade and commerce only, without any reference to the state of religion and morality among them. For why are other lands, which are much more favored by nature, and which once acted a more prominent part in the history of the world, but now morally ruined, also in an external aspect so distracted and full of poverty and misery?

3. Much greater, however, is the inward reward of benevolence, the serenity of conscience, the divine pleasure resulting from the consciousness of having done good. Active, self-devoting, self-sacrificing love is indeed one of the richest and purest sources of true happiness, and he, who closes his ear to the cries of the poor and the frequent claims of benevolence, robs himself in so doing of the noblest enjoyments, of which we can partake in this world. True indeed this joy is not seldom embittered by the ingratitude and the unworthiness of the subjects, to whom we do good; but this should as little dishearten us, as the sower is discouraged, because some seeds of grain fall inevitably upon the hard way-side, others upon rocky ground, and others still are choked by the thorns and thistles. The greater part of seed, when it is carefully sown, falls nevertheless upon

good ground, and brings forth abundantly, some thirty-fold, some sixty-fold, and some an hundred-fold.

4. If we ministers of the gospel expect greater zeal from our congregations in exercising the virtue of benevolence, then let us consider, that we shall reach this object best, if we set before them the light of a good example. We are by no means excepted from the duty of exercising the duty of love, compassion and benevolence, rather in this precisely lies our strength. It is true, our first and principal duty is to devote our mental powers, and all our time to the Lord; but this does by no means exclude the less important bodily gifts. Let us take an example from among apostolic men of modern and ancient times. *John Wesley* made it a rule to be satisfied with 28£., and to devote what was over to benevolent objects; in the first year he devoted 2£, in the succeeding year 32£, in the fourth 92£, to the support of the poor, and so on; so that he gave much more away than he used for himself. Think of *Augustus Hermann Franke*, who notwithstanding his small means, accomplished incredible things, won for himself one of the first positions among the noblest philanthropists, and in his Orphan-House, at Halle, erected an imperishable monument of love to mankind, of faith in God, of devotion and perseverance. We will also not disdain to learn from that brilliant example of Roman Catholic piety, *Charles Borromeo*, the founder of Sabbath Schools so greatly blessed, whose charitableness almost surpasses description, who as Arch-Bishop of Milan, gave yearly the third part of his income to the poor, applied another third to the building and repairing of churches, and besides founded ten colleges, five hospitals, and a multitude of other benevolent institutions; whilst as for himself he lived in apostolic simplicity and humility, denied himself all comforts, at last even his own bed, and found his greatest pleasure in visiting the huts of misery, of poverty and sickness, and in giving counsel, comfort and aid to the needy and suffering. How we must blush, when we compare ourselves with the apostle *Paul*, who during the day preached the gospel, and in the still hours of night labored with his hands for his own and his companions' support, that he might not be burdensome to the congregations, and to leave them and all ministers of the gospel a lofty example of self-denying love for imitation! But above all we would hold out to view, the most sublime model of all virtue and piety, our adorable *Saviour*, to whom these and all saints look up with reverence and humility, from whom they receive all power for good, who exchanged His divine majesty for earthly poverty, to make us rich, who during

His earthly life, had no where to lay his head, that we might thereby be made partakers of His eternal glory !

5. Finally, however, we would not forget, that the chief matter and the first duty of the Christian in the end after all is to devote *himself*, his person, his heart, and his life to the Lord, who died for him, and that all other gifts of love lose their worth, when they do not flow from this great personal offering and from a living union with Christ. We may indeed overvalue external charity, if we separate it from its proper fountain. The apostle speaks of a sacrifice, that bestows all its goods upon the poor, and gives the body to be burned, but which after all is destitute of true charity, and therefore it profiteth nothing, (1 Cor. xiii : 3). Out of a living union of our whole person with Christ, alone sprout genuine piety and virtue, and with it also genuine charity and benevolence. If we have once surrendered ourselves, our heart and life to the Lord, then it will be a small thing for us, to devote our money, this dust of the earth, to His kingdom. Therefore let us,—this is the surest way to systematic benevolence,—above all things labor with this end in view, to present ourselves and our congregations as a living sacrifice to the Lord, and to be as closely united to Him as the branch to the vine, the member to the head, so that we shall no more live, but Christ live, think and will in us, speak and testify out of us, and work and accomplish through us acts of seeking and saving love. Ministers and laymen of the German Reformed Church, let us not only commit to memory, but lay to heart, and act out in our lives, that precious answer to the first question of our excellent Heidelberg Catechism : “That I with body and soul, both in life and death, am not my own, but belong to my faithful Saviour Jesus Christ.”

Mercersburg, Pa.

P. S.

THEOLOGY OF LINGUISTICS.

THERE are but three possible hypotheses in regard to the origin of language ; (1) that it originated in the necessities, and is the invention of man ; or (2) that it has its origin in the nature of the human mind, and is, therefore, in a sense, an instinct of humanity ; or (3) that it was communicated to man from heaven, and is, therefore, of divine original. The first of these opinions belongs only to that age of scepticism when it took its rise, and has long since slumbered in the tomb of the past. The second and third have much in common requisite to be noticed, in order to mark more precisely their points of difference. Both assume the truth of the following *postulates*.

1. That language is neither arbitrary nor conventional.
2. That articulate sounds have a natural adaptedness to express certain specific ideas.
3. That every articulate sound has a specific import.
4. That there is a general correspondence between the inward thought and feeling, and its external manifestation.
5. That these correspondencies are governed by analogies, real and supposed.
6. That the radical or primitive meaning of a root will be that which lies nearest the soul of man, and is most likely first to affect it.
7. That the fundamental laws of all languages must be essentially the same.
8. That *language* is the external manifestation of mind ; or, in other words, it is a nicely adjusted machine, the visible movements of which, reveal to us the invisible workings of the inner spiritual part, the soul of man.

Thus much is substantially assumed by both hypotheses. They differ, in that, while one supposes the significance of articulate sounds to arise solely, or mainly from the fact, that they are the proper instinctive expression of the feelings that originated them ; the other supposes the *expression* of certain feelings, by certain sounds, to have been of divine original, equally with the feeling itself. One regards language as the *going out* of human thought and feeling, in a human form, through the power, of human instinct ; the other, as the *leading out* of human thought and feeling, in a human form, by the power of the Creator. The first makes the objective word as truly human, as the subjective idea ; the other supposes the objective word to have been, at first, as truly divine, as the mind in which the

subjective idea is conceived, and that the one was formed for the other, by the power of Him who made all things out of nothing. According to the first of these hypotheses, there would be such a correspondence of language with the wants and feeling of the soul, as might be called the *Psychology of Language or Linguistics*. According to the other hypothesis, there might naturally be expected such a recognition of divine truths, inwrought into the very structure of language, as to raise a strong presumption of its divine original, and hence would arise a department of language, which might be appropriately termed the *Theology of Linguistics*. The latter view includes all that properly belongs to the former, and adds to it a divine element, making it as interesting to the Theologian, as to the Philosopher. Under the one aspect, language is regarded as the development of the faculties of the soul, through its own native instincts; under the other, it is considered the *leading out* of the soul by the power of God.

The title of this article is a sufficient indication of the opinion we have adopted, and we must bespeak the kind forbearance of our readers, if what we have to offer upon this new topic, should at first seem to them dry or uninteresting. If it shall be found upon examination to possess a tithe of the interest to others which it has to us, it will amply repay them for their trouble. It may not be amiss to suggest, in this place, some of the advantages which this view possesses over every other, in its application to things, as they actually exist. If language had its origin solely in the human mind, and if that mind remains essentially the same under all the variety of circumstances, in which it may be placed, no good reason can be given, why there should be such a variety of languages in the world; nor why the same language should be apparently so unlike, in different periods of its history. But if the first elements of language were communicated to man, in his primitive state, and have been delivered down from age to age, by tradition, then an obvious reason presents itself, why, under the mutations of time and circumstance, there should be, at this period of the world, such a variety of languages, and why, as we ascend toward the common fountain of all, we should find an increasing similarity between languages, whose descendants are as dissimilar as possible. Thus, nothing can be more unlike than the modern German, and the present languages of India, and yet, no one at all acquainted with the oldest Germanic languages, and the old Sanscrit, can doubt for one moment, that they were derived from a common source. So, too, those who

have paid any attention to the subject of Greek and Latin etymology, and compared the results with Sanscrit roots, can not doubt their original identity. These are points so well established among the learned, that proof is unnecessary.

There is not, however, so general an agreement among philologists, in regard to the affinity of the Semitic, with the Indo-European languages, though it seems to us that there can be no more doubt of the fact, than of the original unity of the Celtic, Gothic, Slavonic and Sanscrit languages. The radical identity of a majority of its roots, with those of the Indo-European languages, is unquestionable, and there are clear traces of affinity in the internal vowel inflections of the verbs as well as in the particles employed in composition and derivation. A few facts must serve as specimens. The Hebrew forms its tenses in the primary conjugation, by certain vowel changes, which are retained in a considerable class of Gothic verbs. The same change occurs in the suffixes of Sanscrit and Latin verbs, and traces of it are found in the Greek and Celtic verb :—

	Past.	Fut. and Pres.	Pp.	
Heb.	kA-tal,	yIk-tal,	ka-tUl,	to kill.
Moeso-Gothic,	bAnd,	bln-da,	bUn-dans,	to bind.
Ang-Sax.	bAnd,	bln-de,	bUn-den,	to bind.
Germ.	b-And,	bln-de,	ge-bUn-den,	to bind.
Eng.	sAng,	sIng,	sUng-en,	to sing.
Lat.	—At,	—It,	—tUs.-tUr-us,	(suffixes.)
Sansc.	—At,	—It,	—Uat,	(suffixes.)
Icelandic.	rAnn,	rEnn,	rUn-nit,	to run.

The *α*, is also prefixed to the past tenses of Sanscrit and old Celtic verbs, and inflected into *ai*, and *au*, forms the common prefix of the past tense of old Coptic verbs. By a still further inflection it become, in the Greek, *e*, and forms the prefix (temporal augment) of the past tenses of verbs in that language.

Again, the personal endings of Hebrew verbs are known to be fragments of Hebrew pronouns, and the same endings are found to a great extent, in all the Indo-European, and some other languages. This will be evident from a comparison of the suffixes in various languages.

	Sing.			Plur.		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
Hebrew,	—i,-n,	t,-k,	—;	nu,	tem,	—.
Coptic,	ti,-ni,	k,-t,	f,-s;	en,	eten,	eu,-sn.
Persian,	am,	ay,	ast;	aym,	ayd,	and.
Armenian,	em,	o,-r,	r,-to;	mkh,	kh,	n.

Sanscrit,	ami,	as,	at ;	amas,	ata,	anti,
Zend,	ami,	ahi	ti ;	amabi,	atha	onti.
Greek,	mi,	o,-es,	e,-en ;	men,	te,	en,-enti.
Lith.	mi,	si,	ti ;	ame,	ite,	—.
Latin,	m,	s,	t ;	mus,	tis,	nt.
Moes. G.	—,	s,	th ;	m,	jith,	nd.
Ang. Sax.	e,	st,	th ;	ath,	on,	
Germ.	e,	st,	t ;	en,	t,	en.
Icel.	—	r,	r ;	um,	it,	—

The coincidences in the general laws governing these languages, of which the above are but examples, leave no reasonable doubt of a common origin. Nor do we suppose it will be seriously questioned, that the Semitic languages may be classed with the Indo-European. But when we ask for the multifarious languages of the Africans, and the aborigines of this country, the acknowledgement of a similar relationship, we shall not be surprised if the grave philosopher is disposed to deny our request. More especially, when we propose to class the monosyllabic and atactic language of the Celestial Empire, with the syntactic and polysyllabic languages of the world, we shall expect to be met with a sturdy denial. In regard to the languages of the Africans and Americans, we affirm no more, at present, than, that they have not yet been sufficiently studied or analyzed, to enable us to say what are *the roots* of these languages, and that until this be done, we are not prepared to decide how far they may be cognate. Yet, so far as any such examination and analysis has been attempted, the results point distinctly to an original unity with the other languages of the world.¹ In regard to the Chinese, we are not prepared to assent to the current opinion in regard to its utter diversity from every other tongue ; the reasons for which it may be incumbent on us to state before employing it as we propose to do in this article.

That the same degree of correspondence can be found between the Chinese, and the syntactic languages, as between the syntactic languages themselves, the very structure of that language forbids. The agreement, therefore, must be mainly limited to two points, the connection of the Chinese symbols, with the origin of alphabetic characters, and the essential agreement in form and essence, of the radical elements of the Chinese,

¹ Mr. Schoolcraft says of the Ojibwai (or Chippewa): "It may be premised, as a principle which our investigations have rendered probable, that all polysyllabic words, all words of three syllables, so far as examined, and most words of two syllables, are compounds."—*Lect. Chip., Sub p. 197.*

with monosyllabic roots still existing in polysyllabic languages. There are many curious and interesting facts connected with the first of these points; but we have no space for them, at present, though many of them would be pertinent to our inquiry. In regard to the other we lay down this proposition, as one capable of the most satisfactory proof, that, *if the Chinese Radicals are classified according to their primary meanings, cognate roots will be found in the polysyllabic languages, agreeing with those radicals, in form and essence, and also in the general laws of derivative ideas.* The correspondence of derivative ideas, is to be sought mainly in the derivation of the subjective idea, though there are many more correspondencies in the phonetic expression of the objective word, than could have been expected. A few examples, (for we can do no more than give examples,) will illustrate our meaning, and indicate *the mode* of proof by which our position may be established. In selecting examples we are obliged to confine ourselves to a few points, and we, therefore, limit the cognate roots to the Sanscrit and Hebrew, these being good representatives of two classes of ancient and important languages. We give first a comparison of the Chinese pronouns with the pronouns of the Indo-European languages, then an example of the classification of Radicals in accordance with the above suggestion, and subsequently a comparison of numerals. The authorities followed in this article, are MORRISON'S *Chinese Grammar*, and the Imperial French Dictionary by M. de Guignes, for the Chinese; ROSEN'S *Sanscrit Roots*, BOPP'S *Comparative Grammar*, and BROWN'S *Sanscrit Grammar*, for the Sanscrit; GESENIUS' *Lexicon* and NORDHEIMER'S *Grammar* for the Hebrew; and BROWN'S *Hebrew Hieroglyphs*, for the Hebrew and Chinese compared.

No one can read, ever so cursorily, BOPP'S *Comparative Grammar* of the Sanscrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Gothic, German, and Slavonic languages, without being struck with the important part which the pronouns have performed in the formation of these languages. And who ever will take the trouble to compare the results he has thus obtained with the Chinese in its present state, must be even more forcibly struck with the coincidence of the laws and elements deduced by comparative philology, with the existing laws and elements of that language. The Indo-European pronoun of the first person, singular, has everywhere this peculiarity, that the nominative singular comes from a different base from the other cases. The two themes are (1) Sansc. *ah*; Zend, *az*; Gr. *εγ*; Lat. *eg*; Goth. *ik*; Lith. *asz*; Slav. *az*: (2) *ma*, *mo*, in all. The

Hebrew has *ani*, and the Coptic *anok*; the relation of which is clearly proved by Nordheimer, (§. 125). With these the Chinese *Go*, or *Ngo*; *I*, *Me*, is also clearly cognate: forming the point of transition between the *N*, and *G*, of the other bases, both of which are combined in the Coptic.

The principal element of the pronoun of the second person singular, is *t*, or *th*; in Sansc. *tva*; Zend, *thwa*; Goth. *thu*: Lat. *tu*; Gr. *tu*, or *su*; Heb. *attah*; Copt. *ntho*, *nthok*. The Indo-European languages all want the *n*, of the Coptic, unless the *na*, *ni*, of the Genitives is a relic of it. The Chinese pronoun of this number is *Nē*, *thou*, *thee*. Here, as before, the Coptic combines both elements.

The third person singular is variously modified in the Indo-European languages; but the theme in Sanscrit is *sa*, also becoming *ta*, with a demonstrative sense, *he*, *she*, *it*, *that*: Zend, *he*, *hoi*, Lat. *se*; Gr. *ὅς*; Goth. *sik*; Slav. *se*, *sy a*; Lith. *saw*; Heb. *hua*; Coptic, *nthof*; Chinese, *tā*; Celtic, *se*, *si*.

The first person plural of the pronouns, if the opinion of Bopp is to be adopted, seems to be compounded of the singular and a pronoun of the third person, *sma* (Bopp, §§. 331, 333), variously modified. As a verbal suffix this pronoun drops the *s*, retaining only the *m*, or its equivalent *n*: and thus becomes similar to the Hebrew *anahhnu*. The common Chinese sign of the plural is *mún*; which is clearly cognate.

The second person plural is evidently formed from the singular of the same number, in the Semitic by adding *m*, or *n*; and the same is true in the Indo-European languages of the personal endings of verbs of this number and person. The Gothic, however, inserts a *j* before the ending, which is cognate with another sign of the plural in the Chinese, *ngeù*; *j*, and *ng*, being commutes in Sanscrit. The Welch employs *wch*, and the Armenian *ekh*, as the personal ending of the verb of this person; cognate with which is the Chinese plural sign *châ*.

The third person plural, in the Semitic languages, is formed by adding *m*, or *n*, to the singular. The form is various in the Indo-European languages, but the personal endings of the verbs of this number and person have generally *nt*. The pronoun from which this was derived is still preserved in the Welch, *hwynt*; and the Coptic, *ntau*, *they*. The Chinese plural sign *téng*, has the same elementary sounds, but in an inverted order.

The correspondence found to exist between the Chinese, Semitic, and Indo-European personal pronouns, extends also to

the demonstratives and interrogatives of these languages, a few of which will be mentioned. The demonstrative base *t a*, *he*, *this*, and *that*, is the same in form and sense in Chinese, Sanscrit, Zend, Lithuanian, and Slavonic. In Greek, German and English, it has assumed the functions of the article. In Sansc. the *t*, sometimes changes to *s*, which in Zend becomes *h*, which is supplied by the rough breathing in the Greek, *s a*, *h o*, *ô*. With this compare the Chinese demonstrative, *ch ā*, *se ē*, *this*. The Old German *dis er*, *des iu*, *this*, and the Latin *iste*, *that*, *he*, which Bopp supposes to be compounds, (§§. 344, 357) are precisely the Chinese *ts è i*, except in the transposition of the consonants in the Latin. The old pronominal base *i*, (Eng. *e*), by which the Latin, German, and English express the idea *he*, in Sans. and Zend signifies *this*. In Chinese *e* (= *y* of the French writers) is both a personal and demonstrative pronoun, and signifies *he*, *she*, *it*; *this*, *that*. The demonstrative base of the Zend, *a v a*, *this*. is cognate with the Chinese *p è*, *this*, *that*.

The interrogative bases of the Sanscrit and Zend are *k a*, *k u*, *ki*; becoming in the Gothic *h v a*, *h v o*, *h i*, *s a*, *so*; old Saxon, *h u i e*; Middle Netherlandish, *w i e*; Eng. *who*? The Chinese interrogatives are, *s ŭ y*, *who*? *sh ō*, *who*? *h ô*, *who*? *which*? *what*? The Latin *Q u i*, *Q u o*, are about equally related to the Sanscrit and Chinese.

In like manner Bopp traces the case endings of the Indo-European nouns, back to certain pronouns, most of which are employed in the Chinese in the same sense. Thus the case ending of the nominative (§. 134,) supposed to be from *s a*, *t a*, *he*, *this*, which is the form and meaning of the Chinese *t ā*, *he*, *she*, *it*; *t ā*, *that*. The case ending of the accusative is also supposed to have a pronominal origin, (§. 156) in the neuter *t a*, *s a*, *he*, *this*,—in the other genders, *m*, from Sansc. *i m a*, *this*; *a m u*, *that*. The Chinese demonstrative, *n ā*, *that*, has the same force and form as the accusative *m*, while the neuter *t*, is similar to the Chinese *t ā*, *he*, *she*, *it*; *t a*, *that*.

It cannot be necessary to pursue this point further; the facts already mentioned, raising a presumption of an original unity of these languages which can neither be set aside nor gainsaid. A specimen of proof of another sort, is all our limits will now permit us to offer. We give below a list of one class of Chinese Radicals, expressing the same generic idea, by phonetic symbols of the same kind, but represented by characters of various kinds, comparing them with cognate roots in the Sanscrit and Hebrew. We take a root that is not onomatopoetic to prevent all doubt as to the inference that may follow the comparison. We give first

the Chinese word, in the orthography of Morrison, with the meaning from M. de Guignes, followed by the Radical significance deduced from the usage as compared with the symbol by which the word is represented: to which is added cognate roots from Sanscrit and Hebrew.

Chinese Radicals signifying GOING.

- Rad. 10. Jō, *to enter, go into*: R. S. *going-into*. Sansc. gā, yā, i, hi, ī. Chald. hūch, Heb. hā-lach, nā-chahh, (Inf. const. chehheth: rad. chehh)¹
- " 60. Chě, *to pace*; R. S. *going-by-steps*; Sansc. ikh, ūkh, ukh; Heb. hā-lach,
- " 162. Chō, *to run, journey*: R. S. *going-in-haste*; Sansc. chhu, ju, jyu, jhu; Heb. sā-hah.
- " 137. Chōw, *a ship*; R. S. *going-by-water, going-through*; Sansc. chai, jai, sai; Heb. tsā-bah, sā, hhāh.
- " 79. Chù, *a staff*; R. S. *support-for-going*; Sansc. ag, ij, khaj; Heb. sā-'had, ā-shāh.
- " 47. Chuēn, *a channel*; R. S. *place-for-going*; Sansc. chauch, sauch; Celtic, can, *a lake*; cainned, *a channel*.
- " 35. Sūy, *to walk*; R. S. *going-by-littles*, av, shav, ghav ghiv; Heb. sūhh.
- " 157. Tsō, *the foot*; R. S. *instrument-for-going, or standing*. Sansc. stha, comp. Lat. sto, Gr. στα, σταω, ἵστημι, *to stand*.
- " 156. Tsòw, *to walk, to run*; R. S. *going-with-the-feet*, Heb. nā-hats, (Inf. const. hetseth, rad. tse) comp. Eng. *step*; and by transposition Latin *pes*; Gaelic *stap*.
- " 85. Shùy, *water*, R. S. *going-out, issuing, oozing*. Sans. su, oj, shrā, snā. Heb. kā-yāh, shā-gog, shā-gahh, yā-zah.
- " 56. Yāy, *to dart*; R. S. *going-swiftly, darting, shooting*. Sansc. jhā, ji, shī.
- " 54. Yìng, *a journey*; R. S. *going-about*; Sansc. jyu; Heb. sā-hhar.
- " 144. Hìng, *to go, to do*; R. S. *going-to-ones-labor*, rin, kan,² Heb. nā-hag, (Inf. const. heggeth, rad. heg).

¹ The following laws of correspondence govern the relation of roots in the Hebrew and Indo-European languages. Hebrew roots with three perfect consonants should generally be compared in the *Infinitive construct*, as ga-nab, g'nob, *to steal*, (knab), ga-roz, g'roz, *to cut off*, (graze), ta-ram, t'rom, *to trim*. Hebrew roots defective *Pe Nun*, generally drop the *Nun*, in Indo-European roots, as na-vaf, *to wave*; na-kaf, *to cuff*: and roots with one imperfect letter in Hebrew, generally want that letter in the other, as ba-rab, *to bear*; da gah, *to deck*.

² The lingual τ, τh, d, dh, and n of the Sanscrit, are distinguished from the dental t, th, d, dh, and n, by being printed in SMALL CAPITALS. Long vowels of the various languages are marked; all others are short. The Hebrew orthography is Nordheimer's.

- " 146. Ya, to oppose, R. S. going-against; Sansc. kahi, chi, ji, si, yu, agh, jij, satt, shath, yudh; Heb. gūd, kīd, sūr.
- " 145. E, garments, R. S. going-over-and-around, investing; Sansc. ī, chi, styai, guth, hēd, yam; Heb. sūg, sūk, sā-char.

The roots given above as cognate all agree in generic, and generally though not always in specific application. The specific differences, however, are not greater than are common to the same word, as employed in different languages known to have come from the same stock. A single example from among the many coincidences in the derivation of secondary ideas, to be found in the Chinese and other languages, must suffice. The Chinese character called P a ō, and which is the representative of *rolling, turning, and winding*, is also called L ē ě, or L y, and signifies *binding, taking, strength, subtilty, etc.* Chinese L ē ě, *binding, taking*; Sansc. la, lut, lōt, lū, luth: Heb. lūt, lūl, lū'h, lāh, Latin ligo. From the idea of *binding*, comes that of *firmness, strength*; Chinese L ē ě, *strength*, like the Heb. g ā - v ā h, (1) *to wind, bind, twist*: (2) *to be strong*; and the Sansc. t u j, *to bind, to be strong*. From the idea of *winding* comes that of *wrapping-up, concealing*. Chinese L ē ě, *subtilty, deceit*; Sansc. l u t h, *to take privately, to steal*; l u n t, *to deceive, conceal*; Latin, l a t e o, *to lurk, skulk*; Gr. l a n t h a n ō, *to be concealed, unknown*; Celtic, l u i d, *to lie, deceive*; Anglo-Saxon, l i g, *a lie*. The same idea is retained in the *Hebrew* l ū t, and *English* l o t. The A-S. has the same idea in h l o t h, *a band of robbers*. Other similar examples might be added to a very great extent if our limits would permit.

One other coincidence of a different kind must not be omitted. Etymologists are agreed that the idea of the *substantive verb* is too abstruse and metaphysical to be regarded as primary in the ordinary sense in which words are thus denominated. And yet the words employed to denote *existence*, are so similar, in form and essence, in the Semitic and Indo-European languages, that no one hesitates to assume their original identity. Nor can there be any reasonable doubt that the Chinese words employed to express this idea, were from the same source, as will be evident from the following comparison.

Chinese—tsaé, shō, beī, weī or oī, hé.

Coptic—ti, chi, sho, pe, ne, o, oi, au, el, thre, thro, onon, shopi.

Welsh—sy, syz, oez, by, bu, byz, au, elu, athu, ydi, mae.

Hebrew—yish, (=ish,) hā-yāh (=ya,) hā-vāh, (=vā).

<i>Sanscrit</i> —as	bhu (svu), av.
<i>Celtic</i> —as, is	ba, be, bi.
<i>Latin</i> —es,	fu (svi).
<i>Greek</i> —is,	pe- <i>lv</i> .
<i>Gothic</i> —is, es,	be, ve, wa.

Of these verbs, the Chinese are, from the very nature of the language, *impersonal*; and the same is true of most of the Coptic and Welsh verbs of existence, though these languages conjugate the other verbs, through various moods and tenses. So also the Hebrew *ish*, or *yish*, is both a noun and an impersonal verb; its use being as nearly parallel as possible, to that of any similar word in Chinese. Facts like these, carry us back with an almost infallible certainty, to the time when all the nations of the earth, spoke a single tongue, from which we may suppose all the languages in existence to have been derived: for, if the radical elements of the atactic and monosyllabic language of China, can be identified as cognate with the roots of the syntactic and polysyllabic languages of Europe and Asia, it can hardly be doubted, that a thorough analysis of all the languages of Africa and America, will bring the roots of these languages within the same laws of influence. We can not hesitate, therefore, to conclude, upon strictly scientific principles, aside from the testimony of revelation, that the radical elements of all the languages of the earth, *so far as examined*, are identical, and that the same general laws of derivative thought prevail in them. And when we consider how various and dissimilar these languages are, we can not resist the conclusion, that science will eventually do for all others, what it has done for them.

But we must leave this point, upon which we have already dwelt longer than we had intended, to consider some topics more immediately bearing upon our present subject. But our limits will permit us to do no more, then give some examples of what we mean by the *Theology of Linguistics*, and to point out some of the benefits to be derived from the study of it. Some of the examples may not at first be apparent to all our readers, but we doubt not that reflection will lead them to see, that our inference must be allowed, unless some better solution of the case can be offered. Our first example will be drawn from the *Numerals*.

The Chinese represents the numbers from *one* to *ten*, by distinct characters and combinations of characters, all significant of ideas beside those of *number*. In other words, its numerals are also employed, separately and in composition, as nouns and verbs. Hence it is reasonable to infer, that *the idea* of the na-

meral, is related to the idea expressed by the word, when not a numeral.¹ It has also three different series of symbols by which these numerals are represented:—the first being called “plain hand,” which is evidently primitive; the second more complex, called “formal hand,” employed in deeds, bonds, contracts and the like; the third called “running hand,” being employed in the lighter species of composition. The different characters representing the same number, are called by the same name, though utterly unlike and entirely independent of each other, excepting those which represent the number *five*. We shall speak mainly of the “plain” or primitive characters.

ONE. The Chinese character representing *unity*, called yā, and ā, is represented by a horizontal line with a slight turn at the end, closely resembling the linear figure of the *outstretched arm* in the Egyptian hieroglyph for the letter α. There would seem to be little doubt of their original identity. The significance of this character, in Chinese, is that of *unity, priority, beginning, perfection*; characteristics, which, in their highest and truest sense, belong to Deity alone. In correspondence with this, the old Egyptians employed this character, in a modified form, to represent God, as *all-powerful*; and the Hebrew retains *the idea* of the “outstretched arm,” as a symbol of Almighty power. The syllable *ya*, or *ye*, also enters into many names of the Deity. It forms the first syllable of JEHOVAH, or more properly YEHOVAH, if we may judge from the abbreviated forms, YAH, and YO. It seems also to be the first syllable of the Phenician *jao*, *jeuo*, Samaritan *jabe*, Latin *jove*. The identity of the words signifying *Unity* and *Deity*, is conspicuous in the Scandinavian *Odin, one*; and *Odin, or Woden, God, the chief of the Gods*. Bopp supposes this numeral to have come from a pronoun, and we see no reason why the demonstrative sense he ascribed to it, may not be granted. Indeed the old “ha” which he recognises in “half” and “halt,” may be better accounted for by referring it to “ya,” than he has been able to do.

Two. The idea of *duality* is represented in Chinese by repeating y a, *one*. It is difficult to represent the name of the double character, in English, the final sound being a lingo-liquid, intermediate between *l*, and *r*, and approximating to, if not precisely

¹ BOPP, §. 331. “I do not think that any language whatever has produced original words for the particular designation of such compacted and peculiar ideas as *three, four, five, etc.*”

like the Sanscrit vowel, *lre*; which often becomes *äl*. The name is written by some *ûrh*, and by others *eúl* (= *úl*), the last of which is probably the nearest the true sound. As a verb, this word in the second series of numerals signifies, (1) *to assist*, *to make strong*, (2) *to distinguish between*, (3) *to part*. It is worthy of remark, that the syllable, *él*, seems, in its first sense, to be identical with the Hebrew *el*, and Sanscrit *al*, to be *strong*, *mighty*; and in its second sense to be like the Chaldee *alu*, *see*, *lo*, *behold*. The Sanscrit *luj*, has both senses, and the same initial syllable, with the sense of *strength* and *sight*, is widely spread through all the Indo-European languages. The Semitic *Allah*, *Eluh*, or *El* and the Phenician *Il*, one of the names of the Deity, seems to be from the same or a similar root. The two generic ideas common to this syllable are *strength*, and *sight*, specifically, *God*, and *light*. Why these two ideas are associated, it may not be easy to tell, but of the fact, there is no doubt. If, however, we prefer the pronunciation, *ûrh*, to *úl*, it is instantly allied to the Ethiopian, *ryj*, *to see*, *oversee*, *rule*, when the connection of the two ideas is obvious; Coptic, *ro*, *a king*; Sanscrit, *raj*, *to shine*, *to rule*, *rājā*, *a king*; Latin *rego*, *to rule*, *reign*; *rex*, *a king*. The English has both ideas in the words *rule*, and *ray*. We have also presumptive evidence of the association of these ideas, and of their relation to the notion of *duality*, in other languages; Cel. *Día*, *Die*, *Dé*, *God*; *día*, *díe*, *dé*, *light*, *day*; *dà*, *dó* *two*; Greek and Latin, *Ze-us*, *Θε-ος*, *Δι-ς*, *De-us*, *God*; *dies*, *day*; *δω*, *duo*, *two*. It is also worthy of the remark, that the Hebrew numeral *sh'nāīm*, *second*, and which comes from *shā-nāh*, *to repeat*, (as the Chinese denotes this number by the repetition of *ya*,) *to do a second time*; also signifies *to shine*. Bopp's account of this number is among the most unsatisfactory of all his labours.

THREE. The idea of *trinality* is expressed in Chinese by three *yās*, written one above the other, and is pronounced *sān*. When the three *yās* are connected by a perpendicular line, passing through the middle, the character is called *yō*, and *ouang*, and denotes *a lord*, *a king*; and also signifies *to rule*, *to govern*, and is especially characteristic of the LORD of Heaven and Earth. With a point above the line it is pronounced *chù*, and both names are applied to the Deity. The first of these syllables, *yō*, as a name of the Deity, has already been considered in speaking of *JEHOVAH*, under the head of *unity*; and *chù*, is essentially the same element. *Ouang*, may, perhaps, be radically the same word as the Latin *unus*, Gothic,

a n, e e n, e i n, etc., one. Omitting the upper *y ā*, the character drops the name of *y ō*, and takes that of *sh ā n g*, (merely a modification of *s ā n*,) which also signifies **LORD**, and *king*. This word, with a change of final consonants is also a common epithet to denote sovereign power; Persian, *sh a h*, *a king*; *sa h*, *three*; Sanscrit, *sh a l a*, *sh u l a*, *a trident, the threefold sceptre*; *sh ō l a*, *to worship, to adore*; with which compare Hebrew *sh e l s h a h*, *three*; Hebrew *Sh ā d d ā i*, *almighty, omnipotent*, from *sh ā d a d*, *to be strong, powerful*. Similar association of the number *three*, with names of the Deity, is also found in other languages. The Indo-European languages all agree in calling this number *tri, thri, dri, or tir*, and the Germanic nations denominated the chief of their gods, *Th o r*, or *T i r*. The Egyptians also called one of their gods *T r e*, and *T h o o r*; which the Alexandrians turned into *T h o t h*. Bopp attempts no explanation of the radical significance of this numeral, though in speaking of *four*, he suggests that they may have had a pronominal origin.

FOUR. The series of combinations by which the first of the Chinese numerals are denoted, ceases with *three*, *four* being indicated by a character representing *a man*, lying on a bed, or standing upon the earth, or perhaps both, and is called *S e é*, or *S s é*. As a noun the character in the second series signifies primarily, *earthly passions*; and as a verb *to cherish, or indulge the passions*. The Rad. sig. of the Chin. *four*, is, *a man of earth*. The etymology of the Celtic *ke a t h a i r* (*ceayair*), Sanscrit *ch a t u r*, Persian *che h a r*, Russian *che t y r e*, Latin *qu a t u o r*, is doubtful. Bopp, §. 311, supposes it to be "three and one," but his reasons are far-fetched. The old Celtic *ke a t h a i r*, resolves itself into *k é a t h a i r*; literally, *earth-father*, but whether the coincidence is incidental or actual we can not say. The root of the Sanscrit, Russian and Latin, and probably of the Persian also, is *ch a t*, or some of its cognates; of which the Sanscrit has the following, apparently related thereto: *g u h*, *g u t h*, *ch a d*, *kh a t h*, *to come*; *kh a t*, *to wish, desire, cover*; *ks h i d*, *to love*; *ch u d d*, *to bring forth a child*; *k u d*, *to be lascivious*. If these roots are in any way related to the root of *ch a t u r*, *five*, then the Welsh *pe d w a i r*, *pe d a i r*, and Gothic *fi d w o r*, *five*, would seem to refer to the existence of man, as man, rather than to his origin, and might be compared with the Sanscrit *vi d*, *to be, to exist*. The Gothic languages generally leave out of consideration origin and existence, as such, and simply represent the number by a word, which probably signifies *man*, in his character as *man*, that is "the

born," as will be seen under the next numeral. Comp. Sansc. *virah*, Lat. *vir*, Gothic *wair*, Icel. *ver*, Sax. *wer*, Celtic *fe ar*, Span. *varon*, *a man*, with Dut. Ger. *vier*, Frisic. *fiwr*, Dan. *fire*, Swed. *fyr a*, Sax. *feower*, and Gothic, *fidwor*, (like the Welsh *pedwar*,) *four*. But whatever doubt may attach to these etymologies, there is none in regard to the Hebrew, *ar'bah*, *four*, where aleph is prosthetic, and wanting in the derivatives. The root, therefore, is *r'bah*, a derivative from *rā-bā'h*, which denotes (1) *to lie with*, in the sense of bestiality, *to engender*, (2) *to be four* sc. sided, footed, etc.¹

Why the three first numerals should be described by names which have been appropriated to the Deity, in the ancient languages generally, and why this practice is limited to these *three*, and why the *fourth* should introduce us to a being of such entirely different character, and be described by terms and figures so unlike the preceding, are questions it will be difficult to answer, unless we assume the divine original of language, communicated to man, in its first elements, by a Triune Creator.

FIVE. The Chinese symbol for this numeral is *P a ō*,² *to roll, to fold*, between two *y a s*, the last signifying *duality*. It would seem to signify, therefore, *involving two into one*, or more probably, *evolving two from one*. It is called *w o ō*, or *v ū*. The symbol in the second series differs from the first, only by adding the secondary symbol for *man, mankind*. This last is called *v ō*, and both are phonetically the same syllable, the root of which is cognate with *v a u*, in the Hebrew *h a-v a h*, hardened into *ā-b ā h*, and *ā-h a b*, *to breathe, live, desire, love, to be, exist, beget*. The Sanscrit has the same root in *a v*, *b h ū*, *to be, exist, increase, love, v e*, and *v ē v i*, *to desire, to beget*; cognate with which is the Greek, *βω*; Latin *v i v o*; Celtic *b i*, *b e o*, *to live*. With a slight change of orthography it becomes the *substantive verb*, that is the "living name," as the Chinese beautifully expresses it, or verb of existence which has been already considered. The Radical Significance of the Chinese *v ō*, is

¹ The Gothic numeral, may after all, be no more than the Hebrew, with the consonants transposed, in which case it would be cognate with the Indo-European *b e a r*, *to produce, bring forth*. Such inversion was common when language was hieroglyphic, as we know the same Egyptian hieroglyph was read *Resho* or *Shore*; and the same cartouch gave *Icsheph*, or *Shefrē*: etc. According to this view *man* would be "the born," which Bopp §. 797, supposes to be the proper meaning of the Sanscrit *j a n a*, *man*; as in Latin, *h o-m o n*, *the being*.

² Some say of *L e ē*, *Strength*, but as the symbol for both is the same, we may choose that which gives the best sense.

the being, that is *man*; of *vù*, *two-beings-form-one*. This conclusion is favored by the opinion of Bopp, §. 799, where he shows that the Sanscrit *j a n a*, *man*, signifies "the born," and the Latin *ho-mōn-is*, *man* "the being." So the Sanscrit *v i r a h*, (from *v ī r*, *to be strong, robust*,) signifies "the-strong-one." The Hebrew *b a r*, *a son*, (from *bā-r ā h*, *to cut, to form, to create, to beget, to bring forth*,) like the Sanscrit *j a n a*, *man*, signifies "the born," or "the begotten." From the Hebrew *h a v a h*, comes the proper name *Eve*, "the mother of all living," which points to *woman*, made from *man*, as the significance of the symbol for *five*, and serves to illustrate the connection of the Hebrew *h h ō-m e s h*, (1) *five, fifth*, (2) *womb, belly, abdomen*; with which compare Ethiopian, *h y m y s*, *womb*, and Latin *o m a s u m*, *abdomen*. The same facts furnish a natural explanation of the correspondence of the Gothic words for *womb*, and *five*: Gothic, *wamba*, and *fimf*; old German, *wampe*, and *finfe*; Danish, *vom*, and *fēm*; Icelandic *vōmb*, and *fimm*; Saxon, *wamb*, and *fif*; Dutch, *wam* and *vijf*, or *vijbe*. These coincidences give an air of probability to the conjecture that *woman* is a compound of *womb* and *man*.

The Sanscrit and Zend, *p a n c h a n*; Persian, *p e n j*; Lithuanian, *p e n k i*; and perhaps the Greek *p e n t e*, *five*, seem to allude to another characteristic of the female. The Hebrew has the idea in its obsolete root *p ā-n a k*, *to be delicate, effeminate*; Arabic, *p ā-n a k*, *to live delicately*; Syriac and Ethiopian, *to delight oneself*. The Latin *q u i n q u e*, and the Celtic *k u i g*, upon this supposition, might be related to the Greek *g u n ē*, *woman*; which must be referred to *g e n ō*, *to beget*, and therefore signifies, "the begotten." A more full account of this root will be found on another page. The Saxon *fif*, and the Dutch *vijf*, have also an apparently close affinity with the Saxon *w i f*, old German *w i b*, *w i p*, *wife*; which also appears to be connected with the Sanscrit *y a b h*, signifying, *coire, concumbere*. The leading idea of *four*, would seem to be "man,"—of *five*, "woman," being represented in the order of their creation.

SIX. The Chinese character denoting *six*, is different from any thing that has preceded, being the symbol signifying *top*, or *summit*, over one signifying *things doubled*. Its Radical significance, is, *doubled summit*. As a noun it signifies *head*; as a verb, *to finish*. But to what it refers the symbols themselves furnish no means of judging. The character in the second series is compounded of *man*, *a farm or garden*, on *elevated ground*. Whether any reference is thus made to the completion

of creation, and the garden of Eden, it is impossible to say. The name of the character is, lō; which may, perhaps, be the root of the Semitic e l ū l, the name of the *sixth month*, the etymology of which is unknown. This numeral is, in Hebrew and Persian, s h e s h; Sanscrit, s h a s h; Russian, s h e s t; Welsh, c h w e c k; Greek, ἕξ; Latin and Gothic languages s e x, s i x. The Sanscrit, s h a s h, is intimately connected with, if not from the same root as s h i s h, *to complete, to finish*. We can not yet affirm that *completeness*, or *finishing*, as connected with the *sixth* numeral has reference to the fact, that the work of creation was completed and finished on the *sixth* day; but the union of the two ideas in the same root, can not be so readily accounted for in any other way. It is also a curious fact that the Chinese "running hand" ends its system of characters with *six*; *seven*, being *six* and *one*; *eight*, *six* and *two*, etc.

SEVEN. This numeral is denoted in Chinese, by what is sometimes called the line of unity or perfection, passing through another figure, which forms the root or radix of the curve. It signifies *completion of the curve*, or a *complete revolution* and is called t s ē. It seems to intimate that *seven* is a complete rotation or revolution. It also implies, that the division of time into periods of *seven days*, is co-eval with the origin of the numerals themselves; and it points to the fact, that, on the seventh day, God "rested from all the works that He had created and made," as the ground of that division. In accordance with this opinion, we find the ideas of *revolution*, and hence *binding*, and *uniting* or *measuring*, together with the idea of *resting*, involved in this numeral, in a great variety of languages. These ideas cluster around the Sanscrit roots cognate with its s a p t a n, *seven*; s i v, *to wind, turn about*; s a p, s h a m b, s a m b, *to bind*, s h ū p, *to measure*, s h a m, *to be quiet, cease, rest, sleep, dwell*, s ā m, *to quiet, please*, s h u b b, *to measure, create*, s ē v, *to minister, worship, venerate*, s h a p, *to swear*. So the Hebrew s h ē b-b ā h, *seven*, is intimately connected with s h ā-b ā h, *to bind, conquer*, s h ū b, *to turn, return*, s h ā-b a t h, *to rest, to cease*, s h ā-b ā h, *to swear*. The Celtic s e a c h, signifies *seven*, and *a turn*. The identity of this numeral in the Indo-European languages is unquestionable. Latin s e p t e m, Gothic languages s e o f o n, Russian s e m, Welsh s a i' t h, Icelandic s e ō, Persian h e f t, Greek ἑπτα. As far, therefore, as any inference can be drawn from known facts, the ideas involved in the first seven numerals, are all drawn from circumstances connected with the creation; the three first referring to that *Trinity in*

Unity, which exists in God; the fourth, to man as created by God,—the fifth, to man as proceeding from man,—the sixth, to the completion of creation, and the seventh, to the rest that succeeded or followed it.¹

EIGHT. The Chinese character representing *eight*, is the radical jō, which signifies *going*, but as a numeral receives the name of pǎ. The idea seems to be that of *going-forth*, i. e. from the completion of the revolution, and hence *increasing*. The Sanscrit numeral for *eight*, is a s ṭa, which appears to be a derivative from a s ṭ, *to go, to move oneself*, from which comes a k s ṭ, *to increase, become large*, with which may be compared the Greek and Latin verbal ending—*sco*, forming augmentives. The same idea seems to have been retained in the Hebrew as š h' m ō n ă h, *eight*, is nearly related to, if not derived from š h ā m ă n, *to become fat, large*; Celtic, o c h t; Greek and Latin o c t o; Saxon e a h t a; Dutch a c h t; Icelandic a t t a; Gothic a h t a n; old German o h t o; Russian a s m, v o s e m, *eight*.²

NINE. The Chinese character representing this numeral is the Radical P a ō, *rolling, revolving*; denominated k e e u, as a numeral, and signifies literally according to the import of the character, *winding and turning*, without limit, and hence involves the two ideas of *spaciousness* and *strength*. As a verb k e e u, signifies *to collect, to increase*. It is the most perfect and honorable, and mysterious number of the Chin., as also of the Tartars, ancient Goths and Persians, being regarded by Zoroaster as divine.³ In accordance with this idea, we find the Sanscrit n a v a n, *nine*, clearly related to, if not a derivative from n i v, *to be large, strong, new*.⁴ So the Celtic n o i, n a o i, *nine*, is cognate

¹ The second, or "formal hand" symbol for *seven*, in Chinese adds to the symbol for *seven*, the symbols of *wood, water, and the sacrificial knife*;—very plain intimations of the character of the day.

² The second or "formal hand" symbol for *eight*, in Chinese, is composed of the symbols for *the hand, the mouth,—strength, and the sacrificial knife*, and the meaning is, *a sacrificial operation, performed by the hand, at the command of a powerful superior*. One can hardly avoid thinking of *circumcision on the eighth day*, though we can prove no connection between them. It is important to bear in mind that many of the ancient nations practised this rite; as the Syrians, Phenicians, Midianites, Ammonites, Moabites, Idumeans, Egyptians, Troglodytes, Ethiopians, Arabians, Sabeans, Indians, &c.—*Lec. Cot. n. Barb. Ep. c. ix.*

³ Burder Orient. Lit. p. 231. Chald. Orac. Zoro. in Cory. 277.

⁴ The radical connection of *nine* and *new* was conjectured by A. Benary, (Berl. Jahrb. 1832, ii. p. 50), and is spoken of by Bopp §. 317, but neither of them have given as good grounds for the supposition as Brown, Heb:

with its *n u a*, *strong*, and *n ú a*, *new*. The Hebrew *t e s h a h*, *nine*, if from any root in that language, must be, (and there is no reason why it may not be,) a derivative from *ā-s h ā h*, *to be broad, ample, spacious, strong*. Welsh *n a w*, Icelandic *n i u*, Gothic *n i h u n*, Saxon *n i g o n*, Latin *n o v e m*, *nine*.

TEN. The Chinese character representing this numeral, is the line of unity or perfection, on the line of increment. Its literal import is, *ascent of unity*, and is called *s h ě*, and forms the clavis of things signifying perfection. The Sanscrit *d a s h a n*, *ten*, seems to be derived from, or related to, *d i k s H*, *to increase, grow*, *d h i k s H*, *d h ū s n*, *to ascend, go up*. The Hebrew *h's ā-r ā h*, *ten*, seems also to be from *h ā-s h ā r*, *to be straight, erect ; to build, rear ; to increase, grow rich*. Even the Gr. *δ : x α*, *ten*, may be connected with *δ : x η*, which seems to have *uprightness* as its radical meaning. Welsh *d ê g*, Celtic *d e i c h*, Persian *d e h*, Icelandic *t i u*, Gothic *t a i h u n*, Dutch *t i e n*, Saxon *t y n*, *ten*.⁵

Such, in brief are the facts, in regard to the Chinese numerals, as compared with the names of the numerals of the polysyllabic languages of Europe and Asia, and they would seem to leave no doubt of a *common idea*, even where the words by which those ideas are expressed are altogether unlike. Of the pertinency and force of the conclusions we have drawn in regard to this matter, as well as of the theological inferences flowing from them, our readers must be the judge, though it is impossible for us, by any description, to make them *see*, what they would instantly *feel*, if the whole subject were opened before the eye, instead of being but partially described to the mind.

But we must not leave this point without adverting to another fact, which goes to show how closely the numeral system is bound together at its base, however differently it may appear in its various developments. Improbable as it may seem, at first thought, there are strong reasons for surmising, that the Arabic and Roman characters representing the numerals, to ten, unlike as they are, have both come from the same source as the Chinese. The Chinese plain or primitive hand represents the three first numerals, by *one*, *two*, and *three*, horizontal lines, while the

Hiero. pp. 202-204. The symbol for *nine* in the "running hand," of the Chinese makes a curious allusion to *begetting and birth*, in which the ideas of *new-being-in-nine* months seem to be blended.

⁵ The second or "formal hand" symbol for *ten* in Chinese signifies *hands-joined* and hence *ten-fingers* ; thus giving countenance to the opinion of Jäkel, *Germ. Orig. Lat.* p. 98, adopted by Bosworth, in TYN.

running hand represents the same numbers, by the same number of perpendicular lines. This last is identically the old Roman and Egyptian mode of representing these three numbers. If, now, we compare the Arabic figures for these numerals with the Chinese and Roman characters, there can be no doubt as to the identity of the sign of *unity* in all. Nor will there be any more doubt of a general agreement of principle in regard to the mode of representing *two* and *three*. The Sanscrit, Persian, Arabic, and most of the dialects derived from or connected with them, denote *duality* by a character composed of *two horizontal lines*, united in a running hand, thus, Z. The Persian unites *two perpendicular*, and some of the East languages *two oblique lines* in a similar manner, for the same purpose. The Sanscrit, Arabic and Persian combine *three lines* in a similar manner to signify *trinality*. These lines can hardly be any thing but abbreviated y a s, thus making the Chinese, Sanscrit, Arabic, Coptic, Persian and Roman characters representing the three first numerals clearly cognate. Those who will compare all these characters, in their ancient forms, can not doubt this conclusion for a moment. But though these languages all correspond thus far, they all adopt a different principle of notation at *four*, save only the Coptic.

Those acquainted with the Chinese, will see at once, that the Roman character for *four*, (IV,) may be the same as the Chinese character for four, (I L,) without the border, having the right limb of the second character slightly elevated.¹ On the other hand, the Arabic numeral is the same figure with the left hand character drawn across the right limb of the other, (4,) changes which are less than many characters undergo in composition in that language. The Sanscrit retains what seems to have been the original form of the Chinese character for this numeral, except that the hieroglyph of the man stands on the outside of the circular border, instead of within it (8). The present Roman numeral for *five* (V,) is the same as the letter V, of that alphabet. But when we compare it with the ancient and present oriental modes of representing this number, a strong presumption is raised, that the coincidence is accidental. The Sanscrit figure for *five*, (𑀓) which is the Chinese v ù, (𠂇) inverted, omitting the horizontal lines, or y ā s inclosing it, may

¹ BROWN adopts a different view, and conjectures a connection of the symbol for *four* with the original character from which the Hebrew has its *dath*, 𐤄, the corresponding symbol in Phœnician and Runic bearing a striking resemblance to the Arabic digit for *four*.

be seen upon comparison, to have been the original of the Roman V, and Arabic 5, the present languages of the East supplying every link necessary to the change. The Roman character for *ten* (X,) is the same as the Chinese sh ě, in everything but its position, and seems to have come from the same source. The Sanscrit figure for *six*, is the Sanscrit figure for *three* inverted, with the sign of doubling, and the name of *six* in Persian, (shesh,) seems to be the name of *three* (seh,) repeated. The Sanscrit figure for *seven*, (𑖀) shows to *the eye*, what the Chinese speaks to *the mind*, *completion or revolution of the curve*. The numerals for *ten* (10) in Sanscrit, Arabic, Persian, etc., also speak to *the eye*, what the Chinese declares to the mind, *ascent, or advance, of unity*.

That these facts point to an original unity of symbol and idea, in all the various modes of thinking and speaking, prevalent in the world, far beyond what has been generally supposed, can not be doubted, whether all the conclusions of the present critic be accepted or not. Indeed, he does not suppose that every inference he has drawn, or every suggestion he has thrown out, will remain precisely the same as here stated, when all the languages of the world have been carefully examined and compared. But he has no fear that the general principle will be affected. The number of independent facts, drawn from such a variety of sources, all tending to the same point, will not allow him to suppose an utter want of principle at the foundation. That single, isolated facts, or even what may be called classes of facts, may be brought forward, that can not, at present, at once be explained by this hypothesis is to be expected. But they furnish no ground of objection to our position, if as we verily believe, this advances one step toward the solution of the great problem of language, further than any other which has been started.

But the theological bearings of philological inquiries, are not limited to the points or subjects already considered. We find many of the great truths of revelation, in-woven into the very structure of language, and many doctrines which sceptical reason has assailed, sustained by the unanswerable testimony of nature, and nature's God. Thus, we have seen, that the doctrine of *trinity in unity*, as a characteristic of Deity, belongs to the numeral system of all the ancient nations; and, that the language by which this is expressed, signifies that this Deity is the *first*, and *original* cause of all things, with *supreme* and *almighty power* over all, and that all things are *seen* of Him, being open and naked to His view. The same idea is found in other words applied to the Deity.

The Greek, *κατόν*, Latin *centum*, *a hundred*, is of unknown, or uncertain etymology; but the Celtic, the elder sister of those languages has the same word, in the same sense, and the root of it, in its own vocabulary. Thus, it has *céd*, *cead*, *ceat*, *ceid*, *ceùd*, *cuth*, signifying to be *first*, *chief*, *head*; also *to shout*, *rejoice*, *praise*, *to celebrate*; and *gad*, *to pray*. It also has, *céd*, *cead*, *ceat*, *céud*, *céut*, *a hundred*, all of which are unquestionably from the same root; so that *hundred* is the head, or chief number. So the Sanscrit *shata*, *a hundred*, seems to be allied to *shat*, *shaut*, *shath*, *shad*, *shaud*, *to raise up*, *elevate*, *shout*, *rejoice*, *extol*, *praise*. Now the words, which in these languages, signify *first* and *chief*, and also *praise*, *adoration*, are employed in others, to signify, not the mere act or idea expressed by these words, but the being who is *first* in origin and power, *chief* in place and strength, and who should be the object of *praise* and *adoration*. Moeso-Gothic, *Guth*, Goth. Icelandic *Gud*. Anglo-Saxon *Guth*, *God*. Persian, *choda*. Hindoo, *khoda*, *codam*. Babylonian, *Gad*, *God*. A derivative from the same root, also signifies *good*; these denoting that "God is good," or *goodness*. Anglo-Saxon *god*, *good*. On the other hand a similar change in pronouncing the vowel in the Saxon word for *man*, produces a similar change of meaning, in the opposite direction. Thus the Sanscrit, Swedish, Saxon and Dutch *man*, German, *mann*, Icelandic, *mannr*, *madr*, Danish *mand*, Welsh *manac*, is *man*; but the Saxon *man*, Swedish *men*, Danish *meen*, Icelandic *mein*, signify, *vice*, *sin*, *wickedness*. The English has a word nearly related in its *mean*, *meanness*.

The Chinese *sin*, signifies *sourness*, *bitterness*, *acidity*, *sharpness*, *narrowness*, and the Radical significance of the symbol is, *unlimited-increasing-sharpness*, which is not a bad description of *bitterness*, and especially of the *bitterness of sin*. The Sanscrit *shan*, signifies *sharpness*, and *san*, *servitude*; whence it is reasonable to infer that the idea lying at the root of both words, is *bitter servitude*. This, however is the consequence, not the cause of sin, which is a *turning away* from the path of duty, *altering*, or *varying* from the path of rectitude. The Celtic has traces of this thought *sainim* (from *san*) *to turn from*, *alter*, *vary*; *seanaim* (from *san*) *to turn from*, *deny*, *refuse*; and the Gaelic has *saine*, *discord*, *strife*. The Greek *sinō*, *to hurt*, *injure*, *destroy*; Heb. *sā-nē*, *to hate*; Chal. *sh'nāh*, *to change*, *alter*, *transgress*, seem to have a trace of the same root. And perhaps, also, the Latin, *sonus*, *guilt*.

According to the teaching of Holy Writ, *heaven* is a place of peace and rest, high and lifted up above the turmoil and cares of earth, while *hell* is a place beneath, hidden and concealed, a place where darkness and blackness reign forever, ideas which enter into the very essence of the words themselves. Thus the Hebrew *shāmāh*, the root of *shāmāyīm*, *the heavens*, is closely con-

nected with *shābāh*, the root of *shābāth*, *to rest*, differing from it only in the common change of *b*, to *m*. The root *sā-bāh*, or *shāb-a h*, belonging to the same class, also signifies *to please, satisfy*, etc. That the same root also signifies *highness*, is evident from the Arabic *shama*, *to be high*. The Sanscrit *sham* and *sām*, signify *to be quiet, to rest, repose*; and the first, also, *to be wonderful, high, invisible*. So also the Celtic *saimh*, and Gaelic *shaimh*, denote *rest, repose*, etc; while the Chinese *shang*, signifies both *heaven* and *high*. So the Saxon *heofon*, Dutch, *heven*, *heaven*, are derivatives from *hebban*, *to raise, elevate*, and signify literally, *that which is elevated, or high*. The association of the idea of rest and peace with this word, is seen in *haven*, which to the ear of a foreigner, is identical with our word *heaven*.

The word *hell*, is in Hebrew *shēōl*, which is a derivative from *shā-hal*, *to be hollow, cavernous*. This root also signifies *to ask, inquire*; and the common idea seems to lie in the idea of *turning and leading*, (1) turning or leading after, and hence *asking, seeking*; (2) turning or bending over, and hence *covering, concealing*. The Sanscrit expresses the same ideas by roots, which are nearly related, *syāl*, *to seek, ask for*; *hul*, *to cover over*; *hillil*, *to revolve*. And the Hebrew has cognate roots without the sibilant, *hūl*, *hālāl*, *to turn, whirl*; *to bore, perforate*; and hence *to hollow out, excavate*. The Gothic languages express all these ideas by words from the same root. Thus the Saxon has *hel-an*, *to kill, conceal, cover over*; *hill*, *a hill, mountain*; *hol*, *a hole, cavern, den*; *hell*, *the grave, a tomb*. The idea in all is that of something *hollowed out, or covered over*; like the Greek and Latin *Tartarus*, *hell*, which literally signifies, *turned or covered over and around*, and is hence said to be dark and black.

The word *eternity*, is also a most expressive term in this connection; literally, *revolving-age, or ever-rolling-cycle*, of which the *revolving circle* is an appropriate and expressive symbol. Equally emphatic is the word *ever*. The root is the Sanscrit and Coptic, *i*, Greek, *εω*. Latin, *eo, ire*, which becomes *æti*, in Greek; *aiw*, in Moeso-Gothic; *oe*, in Frisic; *a, aa*, in Saxon, and *ai, aye*, in English, the literal import of which is, *going*. In the strengthened form, Greek, *αιων*, Latin *ævum*, English *ever*, its true import is, *going, going*; a most expressing and emphatic symbol of eternity.

But leaving these general topics, we must advert briefly to some points bearing upon particular articles of faith. We have already seen that the ideas of *unity, duality* and *trinity* as characteristics of the Deity belong to the very essence of language. But thus far we have seen nothing touching the relation of these ideas to each other. That there is *one* God, by whom are all things, for whom are all things, and who is over all things, necessarily follows from points already established. We shall now inquire what light can be thrown upon the relation of these ideas, by the aid of comparative philology.

The relation of the three persons of the Trinity, has ever been described in the Christian system, as the *Father*, who beget, — *Son* who is begotten, and the *Holy Ghost*, who proceeds. Hence arose, at a very early period, the expression, *the eternal generation of the Son*, as descriptive of His relation to the Father. This expression has ever been rejected by those who denied the essential divinity of the Son, and latterly by many who professed to be desirous of holding the truth in regard to the ever blessed Trinity. The objection is, that the language is philosophically absurd and contradictory. The decision of this question, upon philological principles, depends upon the true and primitive meaning of the term *generation*.

The Gr., γεννητος, *generated, begotten*, must be carried back to the obsolete ΓΕΝΩ, as its root, the various meanings of which are preserved in γίγνομαι; and which are, *to emanate, arise, spring from; to become, to be born, to be produced, to live; to chance, to happen*. The Latin *genero, to beget, engender, produce*, is from the same source, and both may be carried back to GEN, as the root, which must itself be referred back to GAN, or GIN. The Sanscrit has the same root, with the *g* softened to *j*, in *jīn, to arise, come into view, to be born; (causatively), to produce, engender, beget*. The Celtic has the same root in *gin, to sprout, spring forth*; and in a strengthened form *gein, to beget, produce*. The Frisian also has the same root in *kinio, to sprout, spring forth; to erect, to stand up*. The Hebrew *cūn, to stand erect, to form, create*; and which in Arabic and Ethiopian, also signifies *to be, to exist*, is also from the same source. The old Gothic had the root, as is evident from its *kunī, a race*, as also from the words *kin*, and *kind*, derivations from the same root abounding in all the Gothic languages.

But there is an ultimate root back of all these,¹ as is evident from the Sanscrit *jīn*, which the native grammarians carry back to *gā*, (1) *to go, go on, go forth*, (2) *to praise, extol*, (3) *to generate, beget*. This root, (*gā*) as we have already seen, is common to both Chinese and Sanscrit, (Chinese, *jō, jy*, etc., Sanscrit, *gā, yā, yū*, etc.,) in the same sense, to which we may add that it is common to all the Indo-European languages. The radical thought, therefore, in all this class of words, is, *going forth, coming into view*, and hence *arising, being born, proceeding from*. Conse-

¹ Although the Sanscrit has preserved its roots in a truly wonderful manner, beyond all parallel in the other languages, not every word set down in the books as a root, is to be considered a *primitive* word. Most double final consonants in Sanscrit have arisen from the insertion of *R. L. N. V.* and *M.*, before the final consonant; generally, without any change of radical meaning, thus making the truly primitive words akin to the Chinese Radicals. The Sanscrit also sometimes adds letters when the cognate languages want them, *shlish, to lash together, matr, to meet, mishr, to mix, chhidr, to cut*.

quently the idea of *begetting*, in the sense in which it is applied to created beings, is its secondary and causative sense, and not the primary meaning. In its true primitive sense, it belongs to the Son of God alone. The true meaning of the phrase "eternal generation," as applied to the Son, is therefore that *from all eternity, he has sprung forth from the substance of the Father, and yet remains in the bosom of the Father, distinguished, but not divided from Him*. Unless, then, there are some objections to this mode of reasoning, which do not occur to us, the phrase in question, is not only proper, but is the most emphatic and descriptive that could be chosen.

To this it may be added, the very name by which the Son is known,—the very word *son* itself, signifies the same thing. The nouns derived from the root we have been considering signify different things, in different languages: Sanscrit, *j a n*, Chinese *j î n*, Armenian *g i n*, *a man*; Gaelic *g i n*, *a person*; Coptic *k e n*, Chinese *k i e n*, *a son*; German *k i n d*, *a child*, etc. The Sanscrit has *s u*, *to go, to move oneself, to beget, to rule*; *s n u*, *to go, to go out, to flow forth*; *s h a n*, *to go, to go forth*. The first root *s u*, is cognate with the Chinese *s e ù* (a symbol of infancy;) and from it comes the Sanscrit *s u n u*, *a son*; Saxon *s u n u*, Gothic *s u n u s*, Danish and Swedish *s o n*, German *s o h n*, Frisic *s u n*, Dutch *z o o n*, Icelandic *s o n r*, Russian, Polish and Bohemian *s y n*. The word *son*, therefore, signifies *that which has proceeded forth*, and is applicable to *Christ* alone, "the only begotten son of God," in its strictly primitive and literal sense.

It may be added that the name *Father* applied to the first person of the Trinity, implies the same thing. The word *â b*, *a b*, *e b*, signifying *father*, in the Hebrew and kindred dialects, also signifies *origin*, and *source*. In accordance with this idea, the Persian *â b*, signifies (1) *a fountain*, (2) *water*, as something proceeding from a fountain. This, or a similar word, with or without the addition of final letters, is the root of the word *father*, in Chinese, Sanscrit, Zend, Greek, Latin and its derivatives, Gothic and all its derivatives, Hindoo and Turkish, and no doubt in many other languages not examined. That the idea of *source* or *origin*, is the radical thought in this root, there can hardly be any doubt, when we look at other derivatives. The English preposition *of*, signifying *out of*, or *from*, and the cognate preposition in all the Gothic languages, can be traced back to such a root. The Sanscrit has numerous words beginning with the syllable *p a*, *p i*, and its cognates, all having the significance of *going, going forth, moving*, as their primary meaning. It has also the preposition, *a p a*, *out of, from*, and *a v a*, *from*. The same preposition occurs, in the same sense, with only the common dialectic changes, in Dutch, German, Danish, Swedish, Icelandic, Gothic, Saxon, Welsh, Latin, Greek, etc.

That the relation of the Son to the Father, is that of *out of* or *from*, is evident from the mode of deriving proper names. The Celtic *O*, Scotch *Mac*, *Mc*, Welsh *Ap*, Dutch *Van*, German *Von*, prefixed to proper names to denote *Son of*, are also prepositions, denoting *out of*, *from*; while the Hebrew *Ben*, and Syriac, *Bar*, prefixed for the same purpose, are words denoting *son*. In English this principle is still more strongly confirmed, since it employs the common ending of the Genitive case, in forming Patronymics or Surnames, along with words denoting sonship. Thus we may say, William-s or William-son, John-s, or John-son, Wilkin-s, or Wilkin-son, Thom-son, Thom-lin, Thom-kin, Thom-kin-s, or Thom-lin-son, etc. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the idea of relationship between Son and Father, is that of *proceeding from*, or *out of*, and hence, it is only in a secondary and cursative sense that the idea of *begetting* is attached to the word, or can be applied to man.

Another name applied to the Saviour is that of the WORD of GOD. Now in a philological point of view, any *word* may be considered in reference to these points.

1. Its *sound*, as spoken, what declares, (*voice*).
2. Its *sense*, as to the idea, what is declared, (*idea*).
3. Its *matter* or *form*, as written, how declared, (*written word*).¹

Judging, therefore, upon purely philological principles, we have the following facts and conclusions. If the term, WORD, be applied to CHRIST, in the strict and proper sense, we must have.

1. What declares—*the Son*.
2. What is declared—*Revelation*.
3. How declared—*Holy Writ*.

Consequently, in Revelation we must have a full idea of the Son, who declares or makes known, and in Holy Writ a full description of what is declared, so that Revelation and Holy Writ must be co-extensive. Hence, therefore, there can be no Revelation or Word of God distinct from the Personal Word, or independent of the Scriptures, as some vainly pretend; unless the term Word of God be applied to our LORD, in a secondary and derivative sense.

¹ The Name WORD is more closely connected in the languages of the world, than at first appears. The root of the whole class of words is the Sanscrit *brù*, Zend *mrù*, to *speak, tell, declare* Sanscrit *BRU*, to *speak, say, tell, declare*; *BRAVa*, *speaking, speech, discourse*; *VkiT*, to *shine, speak, enlighten*; *VRiDH*, to *enlighten, speak*; *VarTH*, a *word, speech, discourse*; Celtic *FOR*, *speech, discourse, enlightening*; a *law, command*; Hebrew *aMaR*, to *enlighten, speak, declare*; *EMe*, a *word, discourse, command*; *DaBaR*, to *guide, direct, speak*; *DaBaR*, a *word, discourse, reason, cause*; Latin *VeRBum*, Gothic *WauRD*, Saxon *WoRD*, Icelandic *oRD*, a *word*; Greek *ePo*, to *speak, say, tell*.

Again, *faith*, in its theological sense, signifies that act of the soul, which so unites man to God, that the Christian may receive from the Saviour, that grace or life, which shall make him a new creature in CHRIST, that is, a Son of God. Faith, therefore, is that act of man, which so unites man to God, that he may receive that which shall make him a Christian. That this is an act of *the heart*, or *soul*, rather than of the intellect, the Celtic and Latin languages clearly intimate. Thus the Celtic from the root, *c r i*, *the heart*, has *c r e*, *faith, belief*; and *c r e-i d*, *to believe*; Latin *c o r*, *the heart*, *c r e d-o*, *to believe*. The Greek $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ is from the obsolete root $\pi\iota\theta\omega$, *to bind, make fast*, like the Sanscrit *p i d*, *p i r*, *to bind together*, *b a d h*, *to bind*, *b u d h*, *to make sure*, *p a d*, *b a d*, *v a d*, *to be firm, fast*.¹ From this root comes the English word *faith*; which therefore signifies *binding* or *uni'ing the heart to God*.

Trust, another word of this class, is from the same root as *true*, which seems to denote, primarily, *that which is fast, firm, constant, enduring*; cognate perhaps with the Sanscrit *d h r ū*, *to be firm, stable, enduring*, and the Hebrew *d ā h a r*, (1) *to revolve*, (2) *to endure, last*, *d ū r*, (1) *to revolve*, (2) *to remain, endure*; *d ō r*, *an age, generation, eternity*. *Belief*, from the Saxon *G e l e a f a*, has for its ultimate root, *l a f*, identical with the Sanscrit *l a b h*, *to receive, hold*. Hence, according to the primary, and strictly literal meaning of language, *credence* signifies that act of the heart or soul by which it *believes*; *belief*, that which it *receives* and *holds*; *faith*, that which binds or unites the subject and object of belief; and *trust*, the endurance or continuance of that union.

Such are specimens of facts which abound in the science of philology, and although they may not furnish ground for definite conclusions they raise presumptions of the strongest kind, that this department of knowledge is to become, in an especial manner, the handmaid of religion. We are very far from wishing to wrest the facts of science, from their legitimate scope and bearing, to sustain any theory,—much less to press them into the service of that science which rests on the authority of inspiration. At the same time, when all known facts in regard to a particular subject, tend to the same point, we are not to close our eyes to the conclusions which they force upon our minds, because they are higher, deeper, or holier than any which the mere man of science, or the sciolist in theology chooses to allow. If all the languages of the world, so far as they have been examined, point to an original substantial unity of speech, of which all the various languages of the earth would seem to be circumstantial varieties, we are not to reject the conclusion, because it happens to be in accordance with the testimony of

¹ In the Sanscrit *b a d*, *to be strong, powerful*, we have another example of the idea of strength, derived from that of binding and winding.

Scripture. But we must be careful to distinguish between facts and inferences, lest we really weaken the arguments we wish to maintain.

While, therefore, we believe in the existence of one Original, Independent, Self-existent, First Cause of all things, from whose Eternal Omnipresence and Power all things proceed, we should naturally be led to suppose, that language would be one of the parts of that system in which the Divine Mind had adapted part to part, and hence that both the *word* and the *idea* would be alike traceable back to God as their first cause, and that one would be no more dependent upon accident or human invention for its existence than the other. Hence, we are led to suppose, that both the objective word and the subjective idea were at first communicated to man, and perhaps also the symbol by which the word and idea were represented. That language is not an instinct of man, similar to the instinct of the beast, is certain from the fact, that it has not remained permanent in all ages as that has done. That it is not dependent on human invention for its existence, or on use for the radical significance of its words, is rendered probable by the fact that so many roots preserved in modern words, can be traced back through a great variety of conditions and circumstances to the earliest ages, without having lost a shade of their original meaning. If language had been a thing of accident chance, or human invention, this perpetuity of original idea could not have been secured under all the mutations to which words have been subjected, without a miracle, greater even than would have been required for its creation.

If language had the origin we have supposed, we might expect its elements, *when properly understood*, to abound in recognitions of divine truths, of truths, too, which the unaided reason of fallen man could not find out. Such being the case, we might expect to find in the very structure of language itself, the impress or recognition of many of those solemn and mysterious truths which Revelation unfolds, so that Natural and Revealed Theology could be found, in the end, to be identical. This view of language accounts for the *similarity of idea* found in all the ancient religions, true or false and also explains satisfactorily why these ideas have been so faithfully retained amid all the perversion and degradation of the religions in which they are embodied. The *idea* is in the very language itself, and can not be eradicated; though the application has been grossly perverted from its original object. Upon this supposition, also, the primitive revelations are not as dim and uncertain as modern minds have been accustomed to imagine. The revelation was in the idea and the symbol of the idea, whether mimetic or phonetic, and it was only as men lost sight of these,—only as men lost the true meaning of the *words*, that a revelation more external and full became necessary, and only when that took place, that it

was given.' It is the duty and should be the pleasure of the Christian Theologian, to search for the traces of these early revelations, as they have been embodied in, and transmitted by the ancient languages, to show their correspondence with the more full and circumstantial testimony of the inspired record, and thus to prove the correspondence of truth whether revealed in Nature or by Holy Writ.

It is because of the inherent and permanent sense of language, that *certain words* are recognized by the Christian consciousness of all ages, as the true exponents of *Christian Doctrine*, and hence, too, why that, the rejection of these words, and the substitution of others, has ever been regarded as evidence of departure from the truth embodied in them. If such words fail to convey to the mind of any individual, the sense which the church has ever ascribed to them, it is either, because, like the ancient heathen, he has lost the proper meaning of the symbol, or, like the ancient heretics, he rejects the truth which they declare. Many things, therefore, which appear to the superficial and unbelieving as mere logomachy, the man of true science looks upon as involving truths of eternal and momentous consequences. The original Unity and Trinity of the Godhead,—the eternal generation of the Son, and the procession of the HOLY GHOST—the relation of the Son to the Father; and the proper two-fold sense of the WORD of GOD, are of the number of the truths which sciolism rejects, but science justifies, which ignorance and unbelief would discard but which intelligent faith believes and will defend. Scarcely less shallow and unfounded, and not less pernicious, is the pretence, that language has no fixed and certain meaning, that the real thought which words represent varies according to the condition of the soul of him who employs them. Truth being absolute must be represented by something as absolute as itself, and unless language does this, we can have no conception of it as such, nor any evidence that what we regard as truth was so considered in ages past, no security that it will be so considered in ages to come. With these brief statements we must close an article perhaps already too long for the patience of our readers.

South Glastenbury, Ct.

A. B. C.

¹ Humboldt, *Cosmos* II. 477, has a remarkable passage from the Indian mythology in regard to China: "Truth was originally implanted in mankind, but having been suffered gradually to slumber, it was finally forgotten, knowledge returning to us since that period as a recollection."

CYPRIAN.

THASCIUS CECILIUS CYPRIAN, the great ornament of the Latin Church in the third century, was born at Carthage, about the beginning, probably, of this period, of a highly respectable and wealthy family. His father, we are told, was one of the principal senators of that place. Of his secular relations, however, including his education and many years afterwards of prosperous worldly life, almost nothing is now known; his biographer, the Deacon Pontius, having judged all this to be of no consideration, and so not worthy of any historical mention, "in view of that spiritual greatness" by which he became so illustrious in the end. We know only that he was possessed of good natural parts; that he enjoyed the best opportunities for intellectual culture; that these were diligently and successfully turned to account; that he applied himself particularly to the study of oratory and eloquence; that he became professor of rhetoric subsequently in his native city, a highly honorable as well as lucrative employment in that age; that he prosecuted his profession with great reputation and success, ("gloriosa rhetoricam docuit," according to Jerome); that he lived in elegant and genteel affluence, as a man of the world, devoted it would seem to mere pleasure and ambition, the lust of the eye and the pride of life, without God and without hope. He was a Pagan; and with all his secular cultivation the vices of Paganism held him firmly in their power.

In this condition however, according to his own confession, he was by no means happy. Amid the pleasures and honors of the world, he had a keen sense also of its unutterable vanity, and sighed frequently after higher and more enduring good. Christianity no doubt had some influence upon him in this way, long before he was brought to yield himself to its power. He could not but approve in his conscience its high purposes and aims; and there were aspirations in him at times, that would fain have burst the chains of sense and flesh, to make common cause with this divine philosophy in its heaven-ward flight. But he had no power to persuade himself, that what Christianity proposed in this case was in any way truly practicable. He saw that no merely natural ability or effort would be sufficient for any such end, the eradication of worldly affections and desires, the conquest of self, and a true surrendry of the heart to heavenly and eternal things; and it fell not in with his carnal wisdom, his natural experience and common sense,

to believe in any real provision for the purpose under a supernatural form. He knew, indeed, that the claims of the Church included the idea of such supernatural help; that powers more than human were supposed to be embraced in her constitution, for the accomplishment of its more than human ends; that her sacrament of regeneration in particular, was held to be not a powerless baptism with water merely, but an actual new birth by the Spirit into such a state of grace as brought with it the real possibility of righteousness and salvation, in a form wholly beyond and above the reach of nature. Of all this he had often heard; for it was part of the daily talk and universal faith of the Christian world at the time; but to his worldly judgment the thing appeared incredible. He was not able to acknowledge the mystery of any such supernatural grace; it appeared to him no better than a fanciful dream; and thus all his better thoughts and aspirations served only to fill him in the end with a more perfect feeling of despair, a sense of hopeless bondage to the power of this present world for which religion itself could offer no relief.

In his tract *De Gratia Dei*, addressed to his friend Donatus, soon after his conversion, he has himself given us a picture of the spiritual state in which he found himself, for some time at least, previously to that event. "I lay in darkness," he writes, "and floated on the world's boisterous sea, with no resting place for my feet, ignorant of my proper life, and estranged from truth and light. Circumstanced as I then was, I found it hard and impracticable to receive the promise held out by the divine goodness for my salvation; namely, that a man might be born again, and that being animated into a new life, through the laver of saving water, he might lay aside what he had been before, and though retaining the same bodily frame put on an entirely new mind and spirit. How is so great a conversion possible, I said to myself, that one should suddenly and at once put off what has either hardened upon him from his own nature or has become inveterate through long custom? These things are wrought, as it were with a firm and deep root, into his very constitution. When does one learn frugality, who has been accustomed to rich and sumptuous entertainments? And when does one who has been used to costly raiment, shining in gold and purple, descend contentedly to plain and simple apparel? He who has prided himself in honors and the insignia of power, cannot stoop to a private and inglorious state. He who has been surrounded with the officious attendance of numerous retainers and clients, considers it a calamity to be left alone.

So universally, it seems to be necessary, that through the seductive force of custom wine should continue to invite, pride to inflate, anger to inflame, covetousness to disquiet, cruelty to stimulate, ambition to please, and lust to hurry headlong in its own course. Such were often my private thoughts. For being deeply entangled in the manifold errors of my own previous life, which I considered it impossible for me to lay aside, I yielded thus to my besetting sins, and through despair of any thing better gave myself up to their power as an evil belonging to me by native and proper right."

This description refers particularly to the period immediately before his conversion, when he was led to think seriously of embracing the Christian salvation. He had formed an acquaintance with an aged and excellent priest in Carthage, named Cecilius, who gradually won his entire confidence, and whose influence on him was happily employed at the same time to engage his favorable attention to the claims of the Gospel. By him he was led to devote himself to the study of the Holy Scriptures, and finally to offer himself as a catechumen for admission into the Christian church. In this state of preparation, according to his biographer, he proposed to himself the highest ideal of Christian perfection; though he was far from being able at once to secure the victory over himself and over the world, to which his ardent spirit aspired. The full crisis of his conversion he himself refers to his baptism, which carried in it for his subsequent faith always the character of a real gift of life bestowed upon him by God. "When by means of the regenerating wave," he says, "the stain of my former life was washed away, and the serene and pure light of heaven descended into my sin-cleansed bosom; as soon as the second birth, by the Spirit derived from on high, had transformed me into a new man, presently in a wonderful way doubts began to be settled, perplexities to solve themselves, and obscurities to grow plain; there arose strength, for what before seemed difficult, and power to do what was before held to be impossible; making it clear, that the first natural life in the service of sin was of the earth, and that what the Holy Ghost had now breathed into me was of God"

Cyprian's baptism took place about the year 245 or 246, when perhaps he was not much less than fifty years old. He always regarded the priest Cecilius afterwards as under God the author of his spiritual life; and in token of his grateful affection towards him took his name into union with his own, calling himself from the time of his conversion *Thascius Cecilius Cyprian*.

He adopted at once what was then regarded as the highest rule of piety, devoting himself in a life of celibacy and voluntary poverty to the service of God. The Scriptures were made his favorite and constant study. He sold his estate, and gave the money as well as almost all he possessed besides, for the support of the poor; "by which," says Pontius, "he gained two ends of principal importance; renouncing and despising all secular views, (than which nothing is more fatal to the true interests of piety and religion,) and fulfilling at the same time, the law of charity, which God himself prefers to all sacrifices." With the study of the Scriptures he joined also that of the best ecclesiastical writers then known. Among these his great favorite was Tertullian, his own countryman, out of whose writings he made it a point to read something almost every day; calling for them as Jerome relates, with the simple word: "Hand me the Master." In a very short time, he was favorably known, we may say even distinguished, for his Christian knowledge and piety, on all sides.

This good reputation created a general desire, on the part of the people, to have him raised to the priesthood; and he was accordingly consecrated, while still a neophyte or recent convert, to this holy office; his extraordinary merit being considered a sufficient reason, for dispensing in his case with the rule, which forbade the ordination of persons of this class. Soon after Donatus, the bishop of Carthage died; and now there was a general cry, on the part of both clergy and laity, that Cyprian should become his successor. Of this dignity however he felt himself to be altogether unworthy; and protesting against his own nomination, with unaffected humility, went so far even as to hide himself by flight, that he might avoid the public pressure. But the place of his retreat was soon discovered; when the people laid siege literally to the house where he was, closing up every avenue of escape, and refusing to withdraw till he should yield himself to their will. He bowed himself accordingly in the end to the necessity which seemed to be imposed upon him so evidently by God himself, and thus became bishop of Carthage not more perhaps than two years after the time of his conversion. His consecration took place, with the unanimous approbation of the bishops of the province, in the year 248. With all this popular enthusiasm however, there was not a universal satisfaction with the appointment. A few of the presbyters, including Fortunatus and Donatus who had themselves aspired to the dignity, with some of their friends among the laity, opposed the election as being in favor of one

who was still only a novice in the church. Cyprian treated this party with great kindness, and bestowed upon them indeed special marks of his friendship and confidence; for the purpose partly of placing them on good terms with the body of the people, who were highly offended with their conduct. But they were not to be subdued in this way. All kindness was lost upon them; a deep grudge was still harbored in their bosoms against the new bishop, which only waited a favorable opportunity to break forth afterwards into open insubordination of the most active and violent kind.

Cyprian entered upon his episcopal duties with the greatest resolution and vigor. However backward he had been to undertake the office, there was no lack of zeal with him, when it had been undertaken, to carry out in full the proper sense of its functions. The energetic, uncompromising spirit, with which he insisted thus on what he conceived to be its rightful prerogatives and claims, has sometimes been regarded as the sign of a hierarchical nature, a disposition to lord it over God's heritage; in which view, to a carnal worldly mind, his previous deprecation of the episcopate must appear to have been no better than a politic feint or sham, a mere piece of mock modesty at best, in no true keeping with the ambition which actually reigned in his soul. Such also is the construction, which this carnal judgment is ever prone to put upon all similar instances of the *nolo episcopari*, as they come before us in the history of the ancient church. But let it be felt that Christianity is what it claims to be, and all this sort of thinking is at once reduced to its proper miserable worth. There is in truth no contradiction whatever, between the backwardness of Cyprian to become bishop, and the high church style in which he afterwards acted as a bishop. On the contrary, both exhibitions of character sprang from the same ground, the firm faith namely which he had in the divine origin of the church, and in the reality of the apostolical commission as something always of force in the succession of its priesthood. His humility led him to shrink in the first place from the honor and responsibility of a ministry, which he felt to be so directly from heaven; and the very same feeling substantially, the sense of what was due to such an office over against all simply private and personal ends, engaged him afterwards to use its resources, and assert its rights, with the most uncompromising zeal. He became in an important sense the organ of the high trust with which he was clothed. However humbly he thought of himself, he could not too much magnify his office. This was, not of man, but of God. However

much his election to it might have been due to the people, he never thought of resolving the office itself, its powers, resources, or rights, into any such popular vote. That would have been to his mind nothing short of absolute blasphemy. Every true bishop, in his view, was a successor of the apostles, and a real bearer of the commission which they received originally from the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. This was the consciousness in which he stood, and that actuated we may say his universal ministry. It is easy to see, how it might impart to this at times an air of something like pontifical assumption, as viewed from the standpoint of the common unbelieving world. But it needs only a slight knowledge of his life, a cursory acquaintance with the spirit that breathes through all his epistles and tracts, to be fully satisfied that his character was the very reverse in fact of every such unfavorable imagination. His hierarchichal ideas were all based, like those of St. Paul, on the renunciation and sacrifice of self. Never perhaps was there a bishop more truly humble, more self-denying, more gentle and affectionate, more ready to render himself up as a holocaust of love for the welfare of men or for the glory of God.

It is not too much to say of him, that he was the complete ideal of a true Christian bishop. His piety, his humility, his charity and benevolence, his gentleness combined with firmness and courage, his unsleeping vigilance and unbending resolution in the exercise of church discipline, were all deserving of the highest admiration. His very countenance, says Pontius, was at once venerable and full of grace, beyond what could well be expressed; so that no one could look upon him, without being inspired with a certain feeling of respectful awe. Cheerfulness and gravity were happily blended together in his looks; and his whole air and manner were such as to make it doubtful whether love or respect should preponderate in his presence; only this was certain, that he deserved the largest measure of both. His dress corresponded with the dignity and propriety of his appearance in other respects; it was simple, without being either ostentatious or mean. His liberality towards the poor, which had been so great before he became a bishop, formed afterwards also a leading ornament of his life. With his presbyters and people, he lived in relations of the tenderest sympathy and regard; dwelling among them as a father; taking counsel with them in all the concerns of the church; and seeking in every way especially to make them sharers of his own spirit, and full partners with himself in the heavenly calling of the gospel. He stood in the most intimate and active spiritual *rapproch* with

his flock; rejoicing with those that rejoiced and weeping with those that wept; making common cause with them in their trials; even bearing their sins in a certain sense and carrying their sicknesses and griefs, as though they had been his own. He could say of them literally in the strong language of Paul: "Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is offended and I burn not? We live, if ye stand fast in the Lord.—For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming? For ye are our glory and joy." He lived, not merely to rule and teach his people, but still more to make continual intercession for them before God. With prayers and tears they were borne upon his priestly heart, we may say, in the solemn ministrations of the altar, day and night.

It was not long till large and extraordinary occasion was afforded in the providence of God, for trying these virtues of the new bishop to the fullest extent. He had not enjoyed his dignity much more than a single year in peace, when the terrible Decian persecution, as it is called, burst like an avalanche upon the Church. The cruel edict reached Carthage about the beginning of the year 250. In such cases, the bishops, as being the acknowledged leaders of the Christian community, were always liable to become the first objects of attack. Cyprian however was especially obnoxious to the heathen party, as being so conspicuous a deserter from its ranks in the last part of his life, and now placed in the fore-front of the opposite cause.¹ The fanaticism of the mob, accordingly, at once fixed upon him for its prey. Circus, amphitheatre and market, resounded with the cry: "*Cyprian to the lions!*" Not being found at once, he was proscribed, and all persons were forbidden to give him shelter or help. The rage of his enemies, however, was at this time disappointed. He saved himself by flight.

This was a momentous step in the circumstances, which was not taken without the most full and earnest deliberation. It was not a question of easy determination at once, to decide in view of all points between the two alternatives of flight or death. The crown of martyrdom was in many cases an object of ambition, in the early church; some were in danger of even rashly throwing themselves in its way; although the rule was not overlooked at the same time, by which our Saviour Himself

¹ In derision, and popular spite, they called him *Coprianus*, playing on the sense of a Greek word which signifies dung.

allowed his disciples, when persecuted in one city or country, to save themselves by fleeing to another. Cyprian had no difficulty in approving the course of others, who went into banishment, suffering the loss of their property, to avoid death. But his own case was not just of this general sort. He was the shepherd of the flock; and the question was mainly, what he owed in this fearful crisis to the welfare of his people. Would it not be the part of a hireling, to quit his post and forsake his charge, just when the wolf seemed ready to fall upon it and tear it in pieces? On the other hand, however, the presence of the bishop provoked persecution.* And then what was to be gained for the flock itself, by allowing the shepherd to be smitten, and the sheep to be scattered abroad, by the very first blast of the storm which was now at hand? Was the church properly prepared to meet the hurricane in that way. Alas, Cyprian knew but too well, that this was not the case; and facts enough of a deplorable kind were soon offered to confirm his apprehension. His clergy wished him to retire, for the sake of the church. Still he seems to have hesitated for a time; being "in a strait betwixt two;" till in answer finally to his earnest prayers, he received what he considered a direct monition from heaven, ordering him to withdraw. So at least his own language in one place would seem to imply^a; and the fact is asserted also by his biographer Pontius. In this way the question was conclusively settled; and with a few confidential attendants, he went into retirement some distance from Carthage, hiding himself at once from both the knowledge and the power of his enemies. But his pastoral relations to his flock were not dissolved by this absence. During the whole time of his recess, though absent in body, he was still with them in spirit; maintaining constant communication with them by messengers and letters; watching over their affairs with intense sympathy and concern; administering counsels, admonitions, instructions and exhortations, suited to their circumstances and

* In his letter on the subject to the Roman presbyters and deacons (ep. 20, ed. Tauchn.) he says: "*Cum me clamore violento frequenter populus flagitasset, non tam meam salutem, quam quietem fratrum publicam cogitans interim secessi, ne per inverecundam praesentiam nostram seditio, quae coeperat, plus provocaretur.*"

^a Ep. 16. ed. Tauchn. "*Audietis omnia, quando ad vos reducem me Dominus fecerit, qui ut secederem jussit.*" This might mean simply a scriptural or providential direction; but for one familiar with Cyprian's faith it refers more readily to a strictly supernatural order, by vision or in some other way.

wants; and above all assisting them continually by his intercessions and prayers.

The simple fact of this earnest pastoral supervision, thus firmly and steadily asserted on the one side and met with reciprocal confidence and trust on the other, through the entire period of his retreat, is enough of itself to shield him from the suspicion of having been actuated in the step, by the motive of mere fear or an unworthy regard in any way to the preservation of his own life. If there was any room for this reproach, says Neander, his subsequent behavior showed at least that he was able to overcome the dread of death, while the calm and candid tone with which he gives account of the course he took in his letter to the Roman clergy, must be considered enough for his justification. But no such doubtful apology does proper justice to the case. To admit the possibility of the weakness in question, is to overthrow the truth of the whole moral relation in which Cyprian is here exhibited to our view. A pious man might shrink from death, and choose flight as the more easy alternative for saving his faith; but he could not in these circumstances, without hypocrisy and guilt, assume a tone and air which would virtually imply the exact contrary of this, as we find Cyprian doing continually in his correspondence with the flock he had left behind him at Carthage. Nowhere does he betray the slightest sense of any such infirmity in what he had done, or the least anxiety to make his position right in the eyes of his own people. On the contrary, he uses towards them from first to last the tone of one, who felt that he had done nothing to forfeit their confidence, nothing to invalidate his pastoral right, nothing to embarrass the exercise of this right in the smallest degree. He places himself right in the midst of the bloody conflict which is going forward; makes common cause with the confessors and martyrs; acts throughout in the spirit of a general at the head of his troops; with trumpet tongue calls them to battle; triumphs in the "coronation" of such as were faithful unto death, as though it had been his own; weeps over the fall of the "lapsed," like a mother in bitterness for the loss of her children; insists afterwards on the discipline of the church, as the necessary remedy for such vast ruin; and at the risk of his own credit and popularity shows himself inexorable in asserting its most severe claims, in the face of a party violently bent on setting aside his authority, and supported to a certain extent by the voice even of confessors and martyrs themselves. Such deportment in such relations is not to be reconciled with the idea of a pusillanimous shrinking from martyrdom in the

mind of Cyprian himself, without the supposition either of vast self-ignorance or else great conscious duplicity. He must have been in one way or the other totally undeserving of moral respect, if he could act the part he did in this style, without an inward consciousness fully answerable to what it implied. And then again, how could any such acted part have engaged the confidence of his people? Those who knew him best, gave him full credit practically for being all that this high bearing continually assumed. The entire relation between him and his church, as it comes out in his letters, is such as should silence at once every imagination of anything like pusillanimity in his conduct. Every such thought, even in the hypothetical and guarded form it carries with Neander, destroys in fact the true verisimilitude of the picture in view; reduces all to the play of mere human and worldly factors; caricatures the supernatural side of Christianity, and in the end, we may say, turns the divine itself into the diabolical. We might as well charge St. Paul with selfishness and affectation in his ministry, and yet pretend to honor him notwithstanding as a glorious representative and true apostle of Christ.

The wisdom and propriety of Cyprian's secession were abundantly shown, in the salutary fruit which grew out of it for the church, both while it lasted and after it was over. Though outwardly absent, he was still the soul of the Christian cause at Carthage, throughout the entire ordeal of the Decian persecution. The faithful were encouraged and animated, by the assurance that he was still at their head and ready to die with them in the end for their common faith. Martyrs and confessors fought their good fight more joyfully, from knowing that his eye was upon them, and his heart with them, in the deadly struggle. When peace returned, there was no one so well fitted to restore the disorders, and repair the breaches, which had been caused by the overflowing scourge. Not only his own diocese, but the church at large, derived the greatest advantage while he lived from his truly apostolical vigilance and zeal; while his writings have proved a large source of instruction and benefit to the whole Christian world, through all ages since.

It has been intimated already, that the church was not properly prepared for the fearful trial which came upon her under the Emperor Decius. A comparatively long season of outward prosperity and rest previously had led as usual to much worldliness and carnal security in her communion. Multitudes professing the Christian name, and not a few even who served at

the altar, had come to be perfectly secular in their character, differing but little either in spirit or life from the Pagan world with which they were surrounded. It is a gloomy picture Cyprian himself draws of this dismal fact, in the first part of his tract *De Lapsis*; a picture, which for the honor of Christianity one might wish to keep out of view; but which, for the right understanding of Christianity at the same time, it is very important in truth that we should be brought to look steadily in the face. In the end, the actual here forms a better commentary on the mystery of godliness, the proper nature of the church in the world, than any ideal that may be substituted for it by the human imagination. The persecution, says Cyprian, was an exploration, mercifully ordained by God to revive discipline and restore faith. Both had fallen into sad decay. "Many, unmindful of what believers had been in the age of the apostles and should be always, had given themselves up to the pursuit of wealth, and were bent only on increasing their worldly estate. Devotion was wanting among the priests, and faith among the deacons; there was no charity in men's works, no strictness in their manners. Men dressed their beards; women painted their persons; both eyes and hair, God's work, were falsified by art into a new form. Cunning deceptions were practised on the simple, and advantage taken of brethren by dishonest tricks. Marriages were formed with unbelievers, by which Christ's members were prostituted to the Gentiles. Oaths were taken not only rashly, but falsely; those in authority were treated with proud insolence; curses flowed from poisoned lips; discords were kept up with lasting mutual hatred. Many bishops even, who should have been a lesson and example to others, renouncing the service of God for the care of worldly things, forsook their sees, and left their people, wandering into other parts of the country in quest of markets for profitable trade, anxious to have money largely while brethren in the church were in extreme want, grasping farms by trading and fraud, and multiplying their gains by interest."

This, be it remembered, in the third century, and before the Church had come to enjoy any toleration by law in the Roman empire. The picture of course sets before us a part only of the Christianity to which it refers; there was embraced in this a large amount besides of very different character. Still there is reason to believe, that this bad side of the case reached very far, and that there was an amount of worldliness and ungodliness in the church far beyond what is commonly imagined of these primitive times. And yet all this was strangely joined, as we

shall see, with the proper superhuman power of faith, and a corresponding presence of true supernatural grace, in the same church, to an extent which was found fully sufficient to carry it triumphantly through the fires of persecution, and to give it soon after the mastery of the Roman world.

The first effects of the Decian trial were terribly disastrous. A large portion of the Christian profession was at once swept away by it, like chaff before the wind. The imperial order required all to conform to the religion of the state, by taking part in some idolatrous ceremony, prescribed by the magistrate in the way of test. In the first place there was a proclamation merely, calling upon all persons to come forward within a certain time, and prove themselves good subjects of the government in this easy way. Only those who refused to do so, exposed themselves afterwards to more active persecution. They might quit the country before the term was up. In that case, their property was confiscated, and they were forbidden to return on pain of death; but they saved their faith. Such as chose not to fly, saw themselves at the mercy of the populace and the civil power, and in danger always of being called to the most severe account. They might be cited at any time to answer for their faith; when if they refused to deny Christ, by doing homage to idols, they were cast into prison, and subjected to sharp torture from time to time for the purpose of overcoming their resolution. Those who stood this trial were honored in the church as *confessors*. In the case of some, the process was carried sooner or later to the issue of a violent death. They were then known and revered as *martyrs*. To the disgrace however of a large number calling themselves Christians at this time in Carthage, they did not even wait till such confession and suffering were required at their hands, as the price of their fidelity to the Saviour; but showed themselves eager rather, on the first noise of the coming danger, to place themselves beyond its reach, and to save both life and property, by submitting of their own accord to the idolatrous test through which this bad security was to be gained. "At the first word of the threatening foe," Cyprian writes, "a very large portion of the brotherhood (*maximus fratrum numerus*) betrayed their faith, prostrated not by the violence of persecution, but by their own voluntary fall." All admonitions and engagements, the hopes of heaven and the terrors of hell, seemed to be at once forgotten. "They did not wait to go up to the Capitol at least by compulsion, to deny on interrogation. Many conquered before the battle, overthrown without conflict, retained not even this credit, that they seemed

to sacrifice to idols unwillingly. They ran to the forum of their own accord, hastened to death freely, as though they had before wished this, and but embraced now an opportunity which they had always desired. How many were put off by the magistrates through the close of day; how many even begged that their own ruin might not be thus postponed!" More than this. "For many their own destruction was not enough; they urged one another with mutual exhortations to perdition, pledged one another reciprocally in bumpers of death. And that nothing might be wanting to the fulness of crime, children also, carried or led by the hand of their parents, lost what they had acquired in the beginning of their life."

The great body of the "lapsed" probably were of this sort. Others however fell with less inexcusable disgrace; yielding only when they were brought to trial; or it may be not till nature was well nigh worn out by long privations and horrible torments. Some allowed themselves to take a sort of middle course, which amounted, in fact however to the sin they endeavored in this way to avoid. They did not themselves actually sacrifice; but by paying a fee they procured certificates, declaring that they had complied with the edict; or it might be, without this, and even without personally appearing before the magistrate, had their names enrolled simply on the official list of those who were thus approved. It was easy to frame a plausible apology for these evasions, especially under this latter form; but they were condemned by the church as tacit treason to the cause of Christ.

Altogether the fall of so large a portion of his flock was a calamity, that filled the soul of Cyprian with keen mortification and distress. It is to him as though the raging foe had torn away from the church a part of her own bowels. "What shall I do here, beloved brethren?" we hear him pathetically say. "In such tumultuating inward commotion, what or how shall I speak? It needs tears rather than words, to express the grief with which the wound of our body is to be bewailed, the manifold loss of our once numerous community to be deplored. For who can be so hard and iron-hearted, who so unmindful of fraternal charity, as to be able to stand in the midst of such vast wreck, such dismal and squalid ruins, with dry eyes, and not at once be forced rather to burst into tears, weeping forth his sorrow before it can be spoken? I mourn, brethren, I mourn together with you; nor is personal soundness and private health enough, in my case, to assuage my griefs; since the pastor is most wounded in the wound of his flock. I join my bosom

severally with all, I share their various loads of desolation and grief. I wail with those that wail, and weep with those that weep, and feel myself fallen with those that fall. Those darts of the raging enemy have pierced at the same time my members, those cruel swords have entered my bowels. My mind has no exemption or freedom from the pressure of the persecution; I too am prostrated, by affection, in the prostration of my brethren."

We might be ready to suppose, that where it cost so little to fall there would be little or no care afterwards to come to terms with the church, and that the fall would easily prove thus for many a total and final apostacy. This however was not the case. The lapsed generally, it would seem, did not mean this, or at least were not able to carry things out to this extremity. Their compliance with idolatry was an expedient merely for avoiding persecution. They still believed Christianity to be true, and saw in the church the only ark of salvation for a ruined world. No sooner were they free from secular danger, accordingly, by means of their defection, than they began to show an anxiety, many of them at least, to be restored again to the state from which they had fallen. The reconciliation of the lapsed, their return into the bosom of the church, became thus a difficult and embarrassing question, before the persecution itself which gave rise to it had come to an end.

Deplorable as the defection seemed however, it was by no means a defeat of the Christian cause. While some fell, others stood. The true life and vigor of the church came more conspicuously into view, by contrast with such partial desolation; and were found amply sufficient to sustain, and in the end to turn back, the full weight of the shock with which they were now tried. Many witnessed a good confession before the magistrate, and went joyfully into prison for the name of Christ; many went into voluntary exile, forsaking their property to save their lives with their faith; while a large number besides, who were not called upon to do so, showed themselves willing to face persecution for the same cause, if it were necessary, by simply refusing to do what was required by the government. The honor of the confessors was still farther advanced by the sharp tortures, that were employed without effect to subdue their constancy; and in the case of a number it came to its full consummation in martyrdom. To this whole army of the faithful Cyprian refers (*De Lapsis*, §. 2. 3.), in tones of almost rapturous exultation. Speaking of the joy with which he looked forward to his meeting with the confessors, on his return from ex-

ile, he exclaims: "Lo! the white robed cohort of Christ's soldiers, who have broken with firm front the impetuous shock of urgent persecution, prepared to suffer imprisonment, armed to endure death! Bravely ye have withstood the world, a glorious spectacle to God, an example for brethren to follow. The religious tongue owned Christ, in whom it had before professed to believe; the illustrious hands, which had been used only to divine works, refused now sacrilegious sacrifices; mouths sanctified by celestial food, after the body and blood of the Lord rejected the contamination of meat offered to idols; from the impious and wicked veil, with which the captive heads of the sacrificers were there bound, your heads remained free; the forehead made pure by God's sign could not brook the Devil's crown, but reserved itself for the crown of the Lord. With what delight does the church, as a mother, receive you to her bosom returning from battle! With what sense of blessedness and joy she throws open her gates, that you may enter, in serried ranks, bearing back trophies from the prostrate foe! Along with triumphing men come women also, who in this warfare with the world have conquered at the same time the weakness of their own sex. There too are virgins, in service now doubly glorious, and boys superior in virtue to their years. Nor is the multitude around you without part in this triumph, following close in the footsteps of your own conspicuous praise. In them is found also the same sincerity of heart, the same firm integrity of faith. Rooted immovably in the heavenly precepts, and established in the evangelical traditions, they were not dismayed by the prospect of banishment, torture, loss of property, or loss of life. A term was set for the trial of faith. But he who remembers that he has renounced this world, regards no day of the world; nor does he now calculate times on earth, who looks for eternity from God. Let no one, beloved brethren, detract from this glory, or disparage the credit of those who have thus kept the faith by invidious remark. When the term set for renouncing was up, every one who had not renounced, in fact proclaimed himself a Christian. The first title of victory, is to have confessed the Lord when apprehended by the hands of the Gentiles. A second degree of glory, is to be reserved to the Lord by a cautious retreat. The first is a public confession, the second private; that conquers the secular magistrate, this is content to keep a pure conscience before God who sees the heart."

In another place (Ep. 10.), he gives us a glimpse of the severe character of the ordeal, through which these heroes and heroines of the cross were required to pass. He is writing to

the martyrs and confessors themselves, yet in prison. "I exult and rejoice, O most brave and blessed brethren, to hear of your faith and courage, in which our mother the church glories. She gloried not long since indeed, when the constancy of those who confessed Christ led them to accept voluntary banishment for his name. This present confession however, as it excels in suffering, is in proportion more illustrious in honor. With the thickening of the fight, the glory of the soldiers has also increased. Nor were ye deterred from the battle through fear of torments, but these served rather to provoke your zeal, so that ye returned still courageously to the terrible contest with unfaltering devotion. Some of your number, I learn, are already crowned; some the next thing to the same victorious coronation; while all, whose glorious company fills the prison, are animated with similar and equal ardent resolution for carrying on the contest; as becomes soldiers in the divine camp of Christ, whose firm faith no blandishments should deceive, no threats terrify, no pains and tortures overcome, since greater is he who is in us than he who is in this world, and no earthly punishment can be so mighty to cast down as the divine protection is to raise and uphold. Proof of this has been had in the glorious engagement of our brethren, who leading the way to others in overcoming torments have confronted the battle with an example of courage and faith, till the battle itself has been conquered and forced to yield. With what praises shall I proclaim your merit, most brave brethren? How sufficiently extol the strength of your resolution, the perseverance of your faith? Ye bore to the completion of glory the most excruciating torture, and yielded not to punishments which might be said rather to yield at last to you. Crowns brought pains to an end, which torments failed to reach. Torture was increased and protracted, not so as to break down the constancy of faith, but only to bear the men of God more speedily to the Lord. The admiring crowd of witnesses, saw the celestial conflict, the conflict of God, the spiritual contest, the battle of Christ, where his servants stood with free voice, with uncorrupted mind, with divine courage, naked indeed of secular armor, but equipped as believers in the arms of faith. The tortured stood stronger than their tormentors, and beaten and torn limbs vanquished those who beat and tore. Faith showed itself insuperable to the long sustained fury of the assault, even when at last, the body a broken wreck, it was not limbs now so much as wounds that were tortured in the servants of God. Blood flowed that might extinguish the conflagration of persecution, that might quench with glorious gore

the flames and fires of hell. O what a sight was that to the Lord, how sublime, how great, how acceptable in God's eyes through the consecrated faithfulness of his soldiery; as it is written in the Psalms, the Holy Ghost addressing and admonishing us also in like words: *Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints.* Precious truly is that death, which buys immortality with the price of its blood, which wins a crown by the completion of virtue."

The man who could write in this style was actuated certainly by no selfish worldly consideration, in holding himself personally aloof from the scene of conflict whose triumphs he describes in such glowing terms. We are bound to believe him, when he declares (Ep. 7.) his anxiety to be back among his suffering people, and represents himself as engaged by a sense of duty only to delay his return. His whole soul was with his flock. He makes the cause of the martyrs and confessors his own, and seems to share with them the glory of their testimony for Christ. It is a subject for congratulation only that one and another, from time to time, are brought to seal this testimony with death. Let those who are still left behind in prison, be ambitious only of the same illustrious coronation. "If the hour of conflict calls, face it boldly, fight bravely, knowing that ye fight under the eyes of your present Lord, and by the confession of his name are advancing to his own glory; who moreover is no mere spectator of his contending servants, but also wrestles and contends in us, and while he crowns is at the same time crowned himself in the issue of our combat." Such martyrdom, and such readiness for martyrdom, are regarded as the highest ornament of the cause to which they belong. "O blessed church ours, to be so irradiated with the rays of divine favor, to be made so illustrious by the glorious blood of martyrs in our own days. It was white before by the good works of the brethren; now it has become purple through martyr's blood. Its garlands lack neither lilies nor roses. Let all strive now for the ample dignity of either distinction; let them lay hold of crowns, either white by work or purple by suffering. In the heavenly camp both peace and war have their own flowers, to crown the glory of the Christian soldier."

While he magnifies in this way the honor of the martyrs, he is by no means unmindful of their wants while still in the body. The presbyters and deacons are urged to keep a continual eye on the necessities, both of those who were thrown into prison, and of others also who in their poverty continued faithful to Christ. The funds of the church must be steadily applied to

their relief. For this the clergy held such money in their hands. His own portion of course was not to be spared. "I beg of you," he writes in one place (Ep. 7.), "to have good care of the widows, of infirm persons, and of all the poor. Also let strangers, if any are in need, be helped out of my own amount placed in charge of our colleague Rogatianus; to whom, lest this may possibly be already all laid out, I now send also by the acolyth Naricus another sum, that cases of distress may be the more readily and largely helped." Due regard must be had still more to spiritual wants. The confessors are urged to give themselves to heavenly meditations and prayers. By the daily sacrifice of the altar especially, they must arm themselves for the great conflict. The priests must visit them in turns, one at a time with his assisting deacon, to "offer" in their behalf; going thus singly and alternately to avoid exciting attention; for which reason also the brethren generally must not go to see them in crowds; lest it should rouse jealousy, and lead to a denial of access to them altogether. "Would that my situation and office," he exclaims in one of his letters (Ep. 12), "allowed me to be now present. Most readily and cheerfully would I fulfil, with solemn ministry, all the duties of love towards our most brave brethren. But let your diligence be a substitute for my care, and do all that should be done for those, who are distinguished through the divine favor by such merits of faith and virtue. Let the bodies also of any, who though not put to the torture in prison yet depart this life there by a glorious end, receive attention and affectionate care. For neither courage nor honor are wanting in their case, to place them on the roll of the blessed martyrs. For themselves, they have suffered all that they showed themselves ready and willing to suffer.— They have endured, faithful, and firm, and unconquerable, even unto death. Where to will and confession in prison and bonds is added the term of dying, the martyr's glory is complete. Finally take note also of the days on which they depart, that we may be able to celebrate their commemoration among the memories of the martyrs. Although Tertullus, our most faithful and devoted brother, who with his other care shown toward the brethren in every active service is not wanting in attention to this object also, will continue to inform me of the days on which our blessed brethren in prison pass into immortality by the end of a glorious death, that we may celebrate oblations and sacrifices here for their commemoration; which we hope soon to celebrate with you also, by the protection of the Lord."

The style in which Cyprian addresses these sufferers for the

name of Christ, it has sometimes been remarked, is not just according to modern evangelical rule. There is often what we can hardly help feeling to be an undue glorification, not only of the martyrs already dead, but of those also who were steadfastly aspiring after the same crown. It seems to be taken too easily for granted, that this crown formed as a matter of course a direct passport to the abodes of bliss. The grand point is made to be simply enduring to the end. We hear no warnings on the danger of self-deception, no calls to anxious self-examination. The subjective side of the Christian salvation is most completely merged in the objective. Then there is a strange want of caution or reserve, in speaking of personal merit. Secular soldiers could hardly be stimulated more directly, by the idea of high desert, or by the prospect of glory and renown. And yet it would be a great mistake, to suppose that this implied no sense of the need of humility and vigilant diligence on the part of these confessors, no apprehension of the spiritual dangers to which they were still exposed. Cyprian in fact often refers to this. He felt that the merit of a good confession, and the praises bestowed upon it, might become a snare; and he abounds in exhortations accordingly, enforcing the necessity of a subsequently pious walk and conversation to make such credit full and complete. We learn from him too, that there was but too much in the actual course of events to justify such anxious solicitude. Some few of the confessors at least fell into gross irregularities and sins. "I hear that some disgrace your number," he writes *Ep.* 13, "and destroy the praise of your excellent name by their corrupt conduct; whom ye yourselves, as lovers and defenders of your own renown, are bound to rebuke, restrain, and correct. What reproach is it to your name, when one lives only to become intemperate or lascivious; another returns into the world, from which he had been expatriated, to be apprehended and punished afterwards, not now as a Christian, but as a malefactor! I hear too that some are inflated and proud." It is a strange glimpse we have in this way, into the interior life of the church in these ancient times. There is much in it, which it is not easy at once to understand, but from which, rightly considered, there may be for this very reason a great deal also to learn.

The object of this sketch is, not merely to give some account of Cyprian, but to illustrate at the same time, from the mirror of his life and writings, the Christianity of the third century. The subject will be resumed hereafter.

J. W. N.

STEPHEN, THE FIRST MARTYR.

ALTHOUGH the doctrine of the resurrection and the strict morality of Christians had first excited the hostility of the Sadducees; yet it was quite natural that in the course of time the opposition of Christianity to the hypocritical self-righteousness of the Pharisees, and to their bondage to the dead letter of the Scriptures, should also come to view. The result was brought about by Stephen, one of the seven deacons of the Church of Jerusalem who was distinguished for his wisdom and power to work miracles. He was in all probability a Hellenist, in other words, of Graceo-Jewish origin: an opinion that may be inferred from the complaint of the foreign Jewish converts that their widows were neglected in the daily ministration—the occasion that gave rise to the appointment of deacons—as well as from his Greek name and his more liberal views of the Gospel. He was the first to set forth decidedly and forcibly the inconsistency of Christianity with lifeless Judaism, and, in this respect, became the forerunner of the Apostle Paul, who sprang from the martyr's blood. Here lies his significance. On the formation of his views special influence seems to have been exerted by the sermons of Christ against the Pharisees (Matt. 23); and by His threatening prophecies concerning the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, (Matt. 24: 1 et seq. 21: 18, Luke 17: 22 et seq.) Stephen held many controversies with foreign Jews who had received their education in Greece, and, it is likely too with Saul of Tarsus' (Acts 6: 9), and none were able "to resist the wisdom and the spirit with which he spake." No doubt he attempted to convince them, reasoning from the Old Testament, that Jesus was the Messiah and founder of a new spiritual order of divine worship, and that, in consequence of its rejection of salvation, the Jewish nation was approaching destruction. Thus he provoked the charge of blaspheming Moses, which was regarded as tantamount to blaspheming God. Men were suborned who appeared before the Sanhedrim and alleged that he had said: Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered unto

¹ To be inferred from the special interest taken by Paul in the persecution of Stephen, (7: 58, 8: 1;) and from the fact that, among those foreign Jews who disputed with Stephen in the Synagogues, those from Cilicia, Paul's native country, are mentioned expressly (6: 9).

us.* What gave occasion to this charge against Stephen, was probably his opposition to the Pharisees, over-valuation of the temple and the ceremonial law, as well as his reference to the abrogation of the existing economy of salvation: a fact that he could learn from the prophetic language of Christ respecting the destroying and building again of the temple, and the cessation of all worship limited to a particular nation or to particular places, whether Gerizim or Jerusalem. But the charge of his enemies, that for this reason he blasphemed Moses and God, was a slander. For the whole of the old dispensation looks beyond itself to Christianity, as the complete fulfilment of the law and the prophets.

The address of this bold witness for the truth, delivered under the inspiration of the moment^a in vindication of himself before the Sanhedrim, (Acts 7: 2—53)—his angel-like countenance the while beaming with heavenly peace and serenity (ch. 6: 15)—is not indeed a direct but an indirect refutation, possessing superior excellence, of the charge alledged against him. In the true spirit of Christ disregarding all consequences, and, carried away by his holy zeal for the things of God, he lost sight of all that might conciliate his judges. Yet his vindication of the divine economy of salvation, enabled every reflecting hearer to make an application for himself to the case in hand. By far the larger portion of the address (v. 2—50) is a review of the history of the Israelites from the calling of Abraham to the giving of the law by Moses, and from this period to the building of the temple by Solomon. In reference to it he quoted a passage from Isaiah (66: 1) against the carnal superstition of the Jews, who imagined that the Most High could be limited to a building reared by the hands of men. Stephen designed not only to evince his belief in the Old Testament by taking this retrospect of sacred history, but chiefly to demonstrate the fearful manner in which the Jews had abused the grace of God. The greater His favors had been the more stubbornness and in-

^a (Acts 6: 11—14.) A complaint, very similar to this, was brought against Christ (Matt. 26: 61): "This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days:" a perversion of his language, (John 2: 19) which refers immediately to the temple of his body, but indirectly to the natural consequences of his death and resurrection, namely, the destruction of the holy sanctuary belonging to the old dispensation, and the introduction of the new christian mode of worship.

^b A fact that may explain some unimportant historical discrepancies that appear in his address. However, these serve only to confirm the credibility of the narrative. Comp. Com. on Acts 7: 6, 7, 16, 58.

gratitude had they manifested towards Him and His ambassadors, particularly towards Moses. The past he held up to the view of his accusers in which, as in a mirror, he wished them to recognize the manner in which they themselves had treated the Messiah and His followers⁴. At the same time, from a particular point of observation, he represents the dealings of God as constituting a theocratic plan that, ever looking beyond itself, becomes complete finally in Christ. Moses already spake of a Prophet that should come after him; the temple of Solomon, constructed by hands of men, was but the type of another—of the worship of God in spirit and in truth. It is probable that he intended also to proceed to the third period of sacred history—to review the Messianic predictions and the conflict of the Prophets with the carnal disposition of the Jews; and more minutely to describe their attachment to externals, their ingratitude and obstinacy; but his hearers, feeling keenly the point in his recapitulation of their past history, were moved to indignation and interrupted him. He passed over, therefore, from the calmness of recital to the pathos of an earnest sermon on repentance and

⁴ John Jacob Hess, in his "*Gesch. und Schriften der Apostel Jesu*," 2d ed. vol. I p. 78 et seq. Zurich, 1778, directs special attention to the fact that this resemblance was in the mind of Stephen, particularly, when he dwelt on the History of Moses. A part of the address sounds almost as if Stephen were relating the life of Christ with but a change of names. "The whole" says he p. 83 "is a picture of the Jews' treatment of Christ. Their manner of thinking as it came to view in the life of Christ, is set forth before their eyes in their past history, as in a mirror. The jealousy of Joseph's brethren, the treatment of Moses both prior and subsequent to his flight into Midian, and the conduct of the Israelites under the dealings of God with them in the wilderness, are designed to represent to Stephen's hearers, their own character and disposition." This work of the Rev. Superintendent of Zurich, as also his "*Lebensgeschichte Jesu*," the more recent works on the same subject seem to have passed by almost without any notice. But it still merits particular regard. Its truly pious spirit and sound investigation should put many of our modern critics who look upon it with contempt, to the blush. "The history of the Jews" he remarks very beautifully in his preface "more especially that of the Evangelists and Apostles, constitutes for me an ever new, an inexhaustible treasury of wisdom and love, my knowledge of which, defective indeed yet always increasing, brightens the days of my life and gladdens my prospects for the future. And I know that any one who will but read with a sincere love of truth, cannot fail to be both convinced and comforted; for the lineaments of the divine character of these discourses, deeds and events are so distinct, even when they are examined by themselves, and much more so when they are considered in their connection with each other, that I can not believe that there is any work of God in Heaven or on earth, which bears upon it more striking marks of a divine origin."

concluded in the terrible language of condemnation, recorded in verse 51-53. Holding up before the consciences of his accusers and judges—those true sons of the murderers of the Prophets—the betrayal and crucifixion of the innocent and righteous Messiah as the culminating point of their ingratitude and rebellion, he flung back the charge of impiety which they had made against him.

Thus, indeed, all possibility of acquittal was precluded; he was not, however, concerned for his life, but only for the defence of the truth. The members of the Sanhedrim gnashed their teeth upon him in rage; but Stephen, looking steadfastly into Heaven, saw Jesus, the glorified Son of Man, standing⁶ on the right hand of God Almighty, ready to protect him and to receive him into glory, and able in the majesty of his authority and might to put all the machinations of his enemies to shame. No longer could these zealots listen to him. Without a regular trial or condemnation or any authority from the Governor—that is in violation of all civil order, for the Romans had abolished the authority of the Sanhedrim over life and death—they cast him out of the city and stoned him to death.⁷ According to custom among the Jews the witnesses, in order to evince their conviction of his guilt, cast the first stones; and not to be encumbered by their flowing garments they laid them at the feet

⁶ As Christ is generally represented as sitting at the right hand of God, the word "standing" (*ἵστηναι* Acts 7: 55, 56.) is remarkable; and is explained by the fact, that the Lord appears to protect and deliver Stephen from the rage of his enemies: a view which was already properly understood by Gregory the Great, who says; *Sedere judicantis (et imperantis) est, stare vero pugnantis vel adjuvantis. Stephanus stantem vidit quem adiutorem habuit.* (Homil. 19, in fest. Ascens.) This unusual expression as well as the phrase "Son of man," which occurs nowhere else in the writings of the Apostle as a designation of Jesus Christ, is another evidence of the authenticity of the narrative. If, as Dr. Bauer maintains, the address were invented and put into the mouth of Stephen by the author of Acts, a more direct and marked effort would doubtless have been made to conceal the fact,

⁷ Hence many commentators maintain that his martyrdom took place soon after the recall of Pilate A. D. 36, and prior to the arrival of the Procurator Marcellus. During the interval such disorders could more easily have occurred with impunity. The lawless proceeding may be explained however without this hypothesis. Fanatical Jews cherished but little respect for the laws of the despised Romans, and in the hour of excitement could easily forget the possible consequences of violating them; or they may have supposed these consequences could be evaded, in as much as the sentence of death had not been pronounced formally, and the execution therefore was not official in its character.

of a young man, named Saul; from which circumstance we may infer that he took a very active part in the execution of this supposed blasphemer and regarded his conduct as an acceptable service to God. But Stephen committed his soul to Jesus, as Jesus when dying on the cross had committed himself to his Father, (Luke 23: 46); then, bowing his knees, and whilst the rage of his enemies was spending itself upon his person, he prayed—imitating also in this respect the example of his Master (Comp. Luke 23: 34)—that God would not lay this sin to the charge of his murderers, and fell asleep.

Worthily does this man of God take the lead in the glorious company of martyrs, whose blood from this time forth should continue to enrich the soil of the Church. Even in the last moments of his life he reflects the image of his dying Redeemer. The principle for which he died, namely, the free evangelical conception of Christianity in opposition to narrow, formal Judaism, lived on after him and was more fully developed by Paul the Apostle to the Gentiles: one who at the time was among his most violent opposers. His death served also to extend the limits of the Church: it was the signal for a general persecution and dispersion of believers in Jesus, none remaining in Jerusalem but the Apostles who, in the spirit of true heroism regarded it as their duty to face every danger. Thus the storm of persecution bore the Gospel-brands into different parts of Palestine, as far even as Phenicia, Syria and Cyprus. (Acts 8: 1, 4; 11: 19, 20.)

*Translated from Dr. Schaff's Kirchenfreund by
Tiffin, Ohio.*

E. V. G.

DR. BERG'S LAST WORDS.

JEHOVAH-NISSI. EXODUS, xvii: 15. Farewell Words to the First German Reformed Church, Race Street, Philadelphia. Delivered March 14, 1852. By JOSEPH F. BERG, D. D. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co.

It is generally known that the Rev. Dr. Berg, who has long been ambitious to head a party and create trouble in the German Reformed Church, by birth a Moravian, by education an American Puritan of the most thorough anti-popery stamp, has seen fit recently to do what he ought to have done long ago, abandon the denomination in which he has found himself so poorly at home for the purpose of trying his fortune in another. Pains have been taken to make the event notorious. It was evidently expected to create a sensation; and this valedictory discourse forms part of the apparatus, or what we may call stage thunder, which has been ingeniously contrived in aid of such end.

The sensation has not indeed come to much. The stage thunder has proved to be very weak. The *mountain* in labor has once more given birth to a ridiculous mouse. This sermon in particular is intrinsically a small affair. Still it merits attention. It is not *beneath* notice, like too much from the pen of the same author in the Protestant Quarterly, by its gross vulgarity and rant. There is some decency in its style, some dignity in its tone. And then it has significance by its relations and accidents; as the end historically of much that has gone before; as a curious exemplification theologically of the intellectual obliquity and wrong spirit of the whole religious tendency, which it may be said in some sense to represent. Altogether, we say, the sermon is not undeserving of regard.

It may be styled in general an apology for leaving the German Reformed Church. This in itself is no very serious or terrible event. To pass from one denomination to another, as the Protestant world now stands, is by no means an uncommon thing; and where the denominations are related to each other, as in the case of the German Reformed church and the Reformed Dutch, as different branches merely of the same historical confession, it is felt that transition from one to the other may very properly be regarded as a matter of mere expediency, which calls in no case for any anxious apology or account. If Dr. Berg found his situation unpleasant, had got into difficulty with any part of his congregation, or felt it desirable for any reason

to change his ecclesiastical relations, he had it in his power to do so with as much facility, and as little noise, as to change his residence from Green Hill to New Jersey. The old Stoic maxim, "If the house smokes leave it," though a very bad one for its own purpose, an excuse for suicide, is of full force for our reigning Protestant church life at the present time. There is no *necessity* in our sticking to any communion. We may at pleasure seek another, and be just as much in the church general when the change is made as we supposed ourselves to be before. Such is the privilege, shall we call it, or the plague, of our glorious sect system. Changing churches is just as small a thing with us as changing sides in politics, or mounting a first pair of spectacles. For such a man as Dr. Berg however, the author of the "Old Paths," the would-be slayer of Goliath Hughes, the redoubtable coadjutor of the Sparrys, Leaheys, Giustinianis, et id genus omne, in their bellowing war upon the Pope—no such every day triviality in an affair of this sort would answer. *He* must play Hannibal or Napoleon. No merely congregational reason for resigning his charge was enough. It must be a denominational affair. He leaves his dear people, if we are to take his own word for it, not because either he or they had grown tired at all of his pastoral relation in itself considered, but purely and wholly on account of what he proclaims to be the false theological position of the German Reformed body as a whole. If any other considerations have had weight with him, they are at least completely overshadowed by this. Here he plants his grand plea, before the tribunal of the world. He joins issue, not with the Race Street congregation as such in any way, but with the Synod of the German Reformed church. *His* going out of the body is to be no vulgar transition simply from one sect to another. It must be a solemn *exodus*; a sort of miniature repetition of the scene which took place, when the Free Church of Scotland went forth from the Establishment with the great Dr. Chalmers at its head. It must be for conscience sake. It must carry with it the air of a great and heroic sacrifice for the cause of truth and righteousness. Dr. Berg goes out as a "witness for the truth;" a glorious *seceder* in his own eyes; another Wesley or Erskine; nay a sort of second Luther, (or if that title still hold good to the immortal Ronge, say then at all events, a *third* Luther,) with special call and mission, if it were necessary, to found even a new church. Happily there has been no need for that. He finds a home for the present in another denomination. But his plea covers the right of secession, in its widest extent. We almost wonder, he

was not led to set up a fresh sect, to try at least the experiment of a schism in the German Reformed Church, to be baptized with his own name. But, "*non omnia possumus omnes*." A captaincy in such case, without even a corporal's guard to follow, is rather a sorry business. Though there might be "more than seven thousand, who had not bowed the knee to Baal, or kissed his images," it was either hard to find them, or they showed no great mind to go dancing a hornpipe after any such mock Elias. It was wise then not to venture a new church, but to take refuge rather in the "old Church of Holland, the Gibraltar of Protestantism," already well known and firmly established. Still the movement must not forfeit, for this reason, the character of a true secession, a veritable heroism for faith, in the eyes of an admiring world. It is pleasant to be a martyr, or at any rate to have the name of one, if it come not to *bona fide* blood, and cost nothing either to stomach or to purse. The object then of this valedictory is to make good a title to such luxury and praise. It is a song, with the ever recurring burden and refrain: "Come, see my zeal for the Lord!" The apology is at the same time a wholesale assault. It is an effort, on the part of the Rev. Dr. Berg, to fix on the German Reformed Church the character of hopeless, well nigh universal, heresy and apostacy, for the purpose of converting into a grand crisis, and surrounding with eclat, the step by which he has now passed beyond its bosom.

But how now is it attempted to establish and sustain this monstrously latitudinous, this exceedingly grave and most solemnly responsible charge? By a process, which has no full parallel probably in the whole history of protesting and witnessing Secedendom. No direct action of the Church itself is brought into question. No plea is filed of oppression or wrong endured at her hands. The universal issue is at once shifted over into the form of a controversy with her theological professors, on whom an effort is made to fasten sundry supposed errors, the blame of which is then held to fall back in some way on the body to which they belong. In looking up these supposed errors, the plaintiff has allowed himself the widest range, going back for them mostly to past years, and gathering them in a loose way from all points of the compass, with almost no regard whatever to order or truth; the object being simply, as it would seem, to get up an imposing show of heads and topics for popular effect. Let us look briefly, in the first place, on these heads of accusation in themselves considered. We shall then be the better prepared, to form a proper judgment of the use to which

they are violently turned by Dr. Berg in his crusade against the German Reformed Church.

I. First we have the vexed topic again of tradition and private judgment. Our suffering martyr sets himself forward as the champion of the Bible, as the only rule of faith and duty, and indirectly charges those whom he opposes with denying this fundamental principle of the Reformation. He moves here however in no small fog; through some concern apparently of seeming himself to make too little of church creeds and symbols, and particularly of the authority of the Heidelberg Catechism, which he professes to hold still in most dutiful regard; though it turns out to be in the end only as he regards a good index to a book, whose errors and mistakes he feels at perfect liberty to correct afterwards by his own reading. His theory runs out thus into the most bald scheme of individual opinion, by which every man is to be his own theologian, and to manufacture his creed for himself. "Denunciations of the right of private judgment," he tells us, "are all unscriptural;" a proposition which plainly means as he uses it, if it have any meaning at all, that the private judgment of every body, be his religious standpoint what it may, forms the ultimate tribunal, the last resort, to which all questions concerning the sense of the Bible are to be carried, before which they are to be tried, and by which they are to be settled, without liberty of appeal. Now the simple statement of this proposition, in its own proper terms, is enough to show its absurdity. It must be shrouded in fog, to be saved from universal derision. No sect acts on any such theory of private judgment. Every denomination has, and must have, its own tradition, its form of doctrine, (whether written or unwritten, is of no account,) its general mind, its historical life be it never so lean and poor, into which the thinking of its individual members is educated or trained from the beginning, and through the medium of which only it is possible for them to exercise this boasted right of interpreting the Bible for themselves, so long as they remain faithful to its communion. This we hold to be for all thinking men the next thing to a self-evident truism. Even Dr. Berg himself, like every other Puritan, has his tradition. What orthodoxy he has, we are very sure, is not of his own discovery or concoction. It has come down to him from that very Mother, the old Catholic Church, which like another Nero he now seeks to destroy. For his *original* determinations in theology, his purely private and independent shapings of the unworked material of the Bible, with all due humility and respect be it spoken, we would not give a farthing or a fig.

How often is it necessary to ding into the deaf ears of Puritanism, that the question here relates not to the proper authority of the Bible, "the great principle of its absolute supremacy," but to *the right interpretation of the Bible?* "The natural man," says St. Paul, "receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Yet he has reason in his way, and the right of private judgment. Shall I go to *him* then, to know what the Scriptures teach? Can rationalism, or heresy, or schism, themselves born of such free judgment, be safely followed for any such purpose? Has every sect here the same right; and is one just of as much weight as another? Is it the doctrine of the Scriptures themselves, that no terms and conditions of a living kind, back of the consultation of this inspired rule, are necessary for its proper use; that Winebrennians, Campbellite Baptists, Universalists, and Unitarians, are on one and the same footing of privilege and power for this purpose with the true communion of God's saints? Most emphatically we say, No. Dr. Berg slanders the Bible, when he virtually affirms the contrary. It offers itself in no such latitudinarian style, to take the measure of its sense from any and every theological standpoint alike. It assumes every where the presence of an objective life answerable to its own nature, in the bosom of which alone its revelations can be rightly received and understood. The obedience of faith, the habit of an actual submission to religion as a concrete supernatural fact, must go before the use of private judgment here, and condition it continually, to make it worth a rush. Without that, it is the private judgment of mere blind nature, which is no better at last than miserable rationalism or infidelity. But now this obedience of faith, this sense of the mystery of godliness as a concrete living fact, is only another name for the communion of saints, and sympathy with the mind of the Holy Catholic Church. One must be in the Spirit, to receive or understand the things of the Spirit. But how can he be in the Spirit, if he be not in fellowship with the Church; if he own no supernatural mystery of godliness in the past history of the Church; if he know not what it is to be ruled or bound at all, in his theological life, by the authority of the Church, thus owned as an object of faith? He may still prate of the Spirit indeed, like the Anabaptists or Quakers or Muggletonians; but if his Spirit be not that of the Church, what title can it have to attention or respect? We pretend not now to settle, when and how precisely this ecclesiastical tradition must be allowed to rule the interpretation of the

Bible.. Much less do we set it against all use of private judgment. All we say is, that the worth and safety of private judgment depend on the standpoint from which it is exercised; that all standpoints are not alike; and that, in the nature of the case, the only right standpoint is that of union with the life and harmony with the spirit, of the mystical body of Christ, as this has existed in the world, in a real and not simply imaginary way, from the beginning. This is not to exact a slavish submission to the Church, as distinguished from the Bible. It is only to refuse a slavish submission to some other system, Puritanism say or Unitarianism, setting itself up as a better expounder than the Church of the true and proper sense of the Bible. Where the issue is between the mind of the Church, as in the articles for instance of the ancient creed, and any such other mind pretending to read the Bible in a wholly different way, there can be no comparison between the claims of the two respectively to confidence and trust; and only to have any doubt about it indeed is to be on the confines of infidelity.

II. The next accusation of Dr. Berg relates to the doctrine of justification by faith; which we in particular are said to have denied, in our work entitled the *Mystical Presence*, by making the relation of Christ to his people to be such, that his righteousness is not merely set to their credit or account, by a fiction of law, in an outward forensic way, but is to be regarded as immanent in their very nature itself. This he will have to mean, that the believer is justified only by his own inherent or personal holiness, resulting from his union with Christ. Long ago we took some pains to show, that no such construction of our language was right. But it has not suited Dr. Berg to bear any thing of that sort in mind: and so here we have the old charge publicly paraded before the world again, without any sort of qualification or reserve, just as though the ninth commandment had been stricken from the decalogue, or were of no force at all for a true Albigensian "witness," sweating and staggering under the weight of so big a cause. Justification, we know, is not sanctification. But still the first must be the real ground or foundation of the second; and this requires that it should be something more than an outward act, that comes to no union whatever with the life of the sinner. It imputes to him the righteousness of Christ, by setting him in connection with the power of it as a new and higher order of life, grace in distinction from nature, wrought out in the bosom of humanity by Christ as the second Adam. This implies that what is so imputed or made over to men is not something out of them, and

beyond them altogether, but a fact already established in their nature itself, although a Divine act is needed to bring them thus into real communication with it as individuals. In such view, the righteousness of Christ, the power of his atonement, the glorious fact of redemption, may be regarded and spoken of as *immanent* now in our nature, just as the law of sin and death is immanent in it also under its merely Adamic view, making room for corresponding developments of individual life. Natural birth sets us in connection with human nature, as fallen in Adam and under the curse; regenerating grace sets us in connection with the same nature, as recovered from the curse, and so made capable of righteousness, through union with Christ. The actual individual life in either case, with such inherent properties as it may be found to possess, is conditioned by the presence of a real possibility going before it in the general life out of which it springs. This real possibility, the potential underlying the actual, is the one man's disobedience in the first case whereby many are made sinners, and in the second case the obedience of one by which many are made righteous, both immanent in humanity for their own momentous ends.

III. Next we have another breach of the ninth commandment, nay the breach of it three times over, in what the author of this solemn act and testimony declares to be the doctrine of the "Mystical Presence" on the constitution of Christ's Person.

We are charged first with teaching Eutychianism; though we have always protested against every thing of the sort, and have taken all pains to follow the tradition of the old church faith, avoiding here both the Scylla and the Charybdis between which it takes its awfully mysterious course. What Dr. Berg dislikes however is just this care to avoid *both* extremes. It must be with him either rock or whirlpool. His theology, though he may not know it, or at least not wish to see it, is in truth Nestorian. He objects to the old ecclesiastical term *theanthropic*, as applied to the Saviour's person. A still surer test is offered in the title *Deipara* or "Mother of God," as applied to the Blessed Virgin Mary. The system of thought in which Dr. Berg moves, makes no room for any such title. He would object to the use of it no doubt as at once popish and profane. And yet for the ancient church it was the very touchstone of orthodoxy over against Nestorianism, just as much as the term *consubstantial* was so also, when applied to the doctrine of the Saviour's true and proper divinity, over against the heresy of Arius. No man whose tongue falters in

pronouncing Mary *Mother of God*, can be orthodox at heart on the article of Christ's Person.¹

Secondly we are charged with teaching, "that sin was in the person of the Mediator, and that the presence of sin in his person entailed the necessity of his suffering;" because of our saying, that the human nature which he assumed was that of Adam after the fall, and so a "*fallen* humanity." which was to be raised through this very mystery of the incarnation itself to a new and higher order of life. To this most abominable misrepresentation we reply in merciful Latin: "*Mentiris impudentissime.*" We abhor every such thought. It is not in our book. We have always disowned it. Paul says of the Saviour, that he was "made of a woman, made under the law;" and in another place we are told, that "he took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham." So in the Heidelberg Catechism it is said, "that he took upon him the very nature of man, of the flesh and blood of the Virgin Mary;" and this again, "because the justice of God requires that the same human nature which hath sinned should likewise make satisfaction for sin." This, and no more than this, is what we also have said; most explicitly and distinctly representing the assumption to have been at the same time in a form, which excluded the element of sin, and was therefore, we may say, an actual redemption of the nature it assumed, the raising of it into a higher order of life in Christ's person, from the beginning. Such has been our view plainly expressed. Dr. Berg knew what it was; or at least knew very well, that we abhorred the thought of making Christ a sinner; for he has been told so directly more than once. And yet here he comes, notwithstanding all this, with a miserable *consequence*, or inference merely of his own arbitrary drawing, to fasten upon us this very abomination; which he is not ashamed then solemnly to promulgate as a proof of heresy in the whole German Reformed Church.

Lastly we are charged, under this head of the Saviour's Person, with teaching the ubiquity of his glorified body. We have only to say here that the charge is false. The *Mystical*

¹ "Protestants respect her memory, as one whom the Lord peculiarly honored; all generations call her blessed, because she was the mother of the man Christ Jesus. But we hold it impious to style her the Mother of God, because her maternal relation to Jesus Christ extended no farther than his human nature." *Berg's Lectures on Romanism*, 1840, p. 143. Nestorius himself never taught, and the Council of Ephesus never condemned, more rank Nestorianism than that.

Presence, in particular, teaches nothing of this sort. On the contrary it affirms, p. 173, that "the relation of Christ to the Church involves no ubiquity or idealistic dissipation of his body, and requires no fusion of his proper personality with the persons of his people."

IV. Another head of accusation is found in the importance we attach to the holy sacraments. We are charged, in the usual stale fashion of the spiritualistic school, with putting the sacraments in the place of Him who appointed them; because we have claimed for them a character worthy of such appointment, making them to be, not dead signs merely; but real seals and vehicles of his adorable grace. "Inherent power to confer grace dwells alone in the blood and Spirit of Christ," we are gravely informed by this most courageous "testis veritatis;" as though he were enunciating a proposition at war with the whole idea of sacramental grace, and stood ready to maintain it at the risk of fire and faggot. This is as if one should say: God is the only source of power in the natural world, and *therefore* it is irreligious and absurd to ascribe activity to the lightning or force to the whirlwind. We have here again gross misrepresentation and slander. The doctrine which attributes grace to the sacraments is caricatured and falsified, to make it odious. It involves, we are told, the notion of an *opus operatum*, in the sense of a power in the sacraments working as from itself merely and in the way of blind magic. This however is a most perverse construction of the doctrine in question; for which too there is no excuse whatever; since the greatest pains have been taken to show, that it is held in no such ridiculous sense. The intrinsic power attributed to the sacraments, it has been said over and over again, is not to be viewed as something different from the grace of which Christ alone is the fountain and source; much less as something opposed to this only cause of our salvation; it is simply the action of this grace itself, exhibited to the faith of men under a divinely instituted form. He who works in nature by means of his own appointment, may surely be allowed to work instrumentally in the world of grace also, by such agencies as to himself seem best, without being supposed on this account to part with any portion of his own glory. This is what we mean by the intrinsic power of the holy sacraments. They belong to the kingdom of heaven, the new order of things superinduced upon the course of nature, by the birth, death, and resurrection, of the Word made Flesh; they are seals of what they represent in this kingdom; they carry in them, not simply the power of shadows in the sphere of nature.

but a truly supernatural force, answerable to the sphere of the Spirit which they serve to bring into real connection with our common human life. In this view they are mysteries, objects of faith, which it is absolutely profane to measure by any standard of mere sense. God has lodged in them a more than natural efficiency, for the accomplishment of heavenly ends; which however works not magically, but to take effect must be met with right dispositions on the part of men.

Dr. Berg, we say, caricatures this doctrine, to fight against it with better advantage and effect. But it must not be supposed, that he does not mean therefore to fight against it in its own proper form. The controversy here is no battle of words merely. The issue is at bottom a very real one, and we have no wish whatever to keep it out of sight. It involves the whole question of sacramental grace. Dr. Berg has no faith in such grace under any form, no faith in the sacraments at all, as the organs of a higher power than that of nature, for the accomplishment of supernatural ends. They are not to his mind *mysteries*. He sees no action of God in holy baptism, no participation of Christ's body and blood, by the wonder-working power of the Spirit, in the blessed eucharist. In all this however he only proclaims his own want of orthodoxy, while trying to make out a charge of error against others. To deny the mystical force of the sacraments, is to deny at the same time the supernatural character of the church, and in the end to subvert, as we verily believe, the whole mystery of the incarnation. The man who does so, may still continue to bluster and talk big about his zeal for the faith once delivered to the saints, abusing all who refuse to fall in with his confident mind. He may cry out: "The Bible, the Bible, the Bible of the Lord are *We*;" as though the private judgment of himself, and such as he, were one and the same thing with the sacred text itself, and no other judgment could possibly deserve the least consideration or regard. He may carry his appeal boldly to the tribunal of the *world's* common sense and natural reason, and stay himself on the verdict of a rationalistic generation of sects, with whom opinion has come to stand in the room of faith, making light of every thing like church authority in its proper form. But all this cannot help the actual falsehood of his position. He is a heretic notwithstanding; condemned by both Luther and Calvin; condemned by the Heidelberg Catechism and the Belgic Confession; condemned by the universal faith of the Church from the sixteenth century back to the fifth and from the fifth century again back to the second;

condemned by saints, martyrs, councils, and fathers; condemned, we will add, by the plain letter of the New Testament, as it has been understood by the Church through all ages. We are not disposed to be chary or tender here in the use of terms. We are put out of all patience rather with those, who pretend to respect the authority of the ancient creed, and yet make small account seemingly of an issue which concerns so immediately its truth and credit. For let it be observed, the question now in view regards not the mode of the sacramental mystery; whether for instance, in the case of the Lord's supper, it be by transubstantiation, or by consubstantiation, or by the mirifical incomprehensible operation of the Holy Ghost in the sense of Calvin and Ursinus; it regards the entire *fact* of the mystery itself. This, we say, entered into the universal faith of the ancient church. And it was not there as an outward accident merely. It was held to be of vital account. It formed the soul of doctrine, and the nucleus of all worship. To disown it then, is to disown the ancient church, and practically to renounce fellowship with the Christianity of all ages before the Reformation, as well as with the proper Lutheran and true Reformed faith of that Protestant epoch itself. To hear Dr. Berg, or any body else, glorying in such a theological predicament, as though it were the perfection of orthodoxy, is much of one sort with the spectacle of some unhappy patient in Bedlam, who sits in chains or rags and yet fancies himself a king.

V. The last offence with which we are charged in this valedictory demonstration, is our refusal to fall in with the anti-pope-hue and cry against the Roman Catholic Church. This evidently is a main point in the general bill of wrongs. It forms the culmination of the universal mischief, the "unkindest cut of all" in the whole list of our provocations. Much else might have been patiently borne. Here patience itself is put fairly out of breath.

Dr. Berg, it is well known, has a mortal antipathy to Romanism. He has long been distinguished as one of the school, which makes a vast merit of hating and cursing the Pope as Anti-christ, and builds its first and greatest pretension to what it calls evangelical piety, on its want of all charity towards Papists wherever found. He has staked his personal credit, his popularity as a minister, his reputation as a theologian, on the anti-pope-hue cause asserted and maintained in this radical style; and the consequence has been, as usual, that the cause in such form has grown to be for him a sort of "fixed idea," synonymous in some sense with the identity of his personal life. He has preach-

ed on it ; made speeches on it ; written a book on it, with a glorifying introduction from Dr. Brownlee. " I shall never apologize," he writes years ago, " either to the people of my own charge, or to the public, for preaching and writing against Popery ; for I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ ; neither am I afraid to lift up my voice and to cry aloud against the abominations of the Man of Sin ; and to rebuke, so far as my influence extends, the impudence of Antichrist.—For the system of Popery, the ' mystery of iniquity,' ' in all its deceivableness of unrighteousness,' and in all the shades and grades of its known and unknown abominations, I do entertain the most hearty abhorrence. I believe it to be the Arch-deceiver of precious souls, and the Master-piece of Satan." (*Lectures on Romanism*, p. 23, 24). Any quantity of similar stuff is to be found in other parts of the same book, as well as in the scurrilous pages of the Protestant Quarterly. In full keeping with this he cries aloud in his late act and testimony : " The Lord is my banner ! Rome is the Amalek with which God never will make peace. He will have war with her from generation to generation ! Rome is that wicked one whom the Lord will destroy, with the breath of his mouth, and the brightness of his coming. Rome is not to be reformed. She is wedded to her sins ; and like the great millstone cast by the mighty angel into the depths of the sea, so shall she be cast down, to be found no more at all forever. They who partake of her sins, shall receive of her plagues. Let them look to it" (p. 21). In all this it is easy to read the symptoms of a very virulent affection. For one who surrenders himself to it, the anti-popery spirit is in truth a disease of the very worst kind. We know of no mental habit, short of absolute insanity, that seems to be more unfavorable to calm self-possession, to the exercise of clear sober judgment, or to the grace of godly sincerity and truth in the inward parts. Where it has come to be fully established, there is an end both of charity and reason, so far as the Church of Rome is concerned. The mind loses its hold on proper realities, and falls as it were under a sort of magical spell or ban which makes it impossible to see anything in its true color and right shape. It moves in a world of perversions, distortions, exaggerations, contradictions and lies, from which however, while the *fixed idea* lasts, no friendly light has any power to set it free. We have an exemplification of this in Dr. Berg. In his battles with Romanism, he spoils his own cause continually by extravagance and excess. He persecutes and spits venom, while affecting to play the bully for toleration and peace. He calls names, and spouts intemper-

ate blackguardisms, while pleasing himself with the idea that he is the pink of evangelical courtesy and good manners. He is himself irreverent and profane in the treatment of sacred things, while heaping accusations of profanity on Rome. He sets up himself, as the personification of private judgment, in order to pull down the Pope; holding with great show of zeal, that all men have the right of thinking as they choose, provided only they think with *him* and not some other way. He is great for free inquiry and light, and yet takes good care never to meet any question at issue in a really honorable and manly style; while all sorts of declamation, sophistry, and falsehood, are resorted to for the purpose of maintaining a show and sham of argument, where all argument in its true form is wanting.

Such is the general style and fashion of this intolerant anti-popery school. No one who has not been led to examine the matter seriously for himself, with some true *Protestant* courage such as is not to be put out of countenance by the mere barkings of fanaticism, can have any idea of the extent to which falsehood and misrepresentation are carried in the common popular warfare upon the Church of Rome. No church, as the great Dr. Johnson used to say, has been more monstrously slandered. Our religious papers, it is to be feared, lie here too generally under dreadful guilt. They are so reckless in their assertions; so ready to catch up every idle story and dirty anecdote, that seems to tell against the Catholic Church; so slow for the most part in correcting their own falsehoods, when they have been fairly exposed; so unwilling to allow good motives and so quick to suspect bad ones, as though Paul's account of charity here had all become reversed, and its province were to rejoice in iniquity and not in the truth. Nor is this the worst of the case. The warfare in question is conducted too generally without any regard to principles. It is forgotten that great interests of religion, deep and solemnly momentous truths, in the very nature of the case, are involved in Romanism; and the whole object then is to overthrow and destroy merely, regardless of all consequences that may go along with the wreck. Anti-popery in such form is purely negative. It seeks only to break down; and every blow is welcome that looks this way, though it be never so rude and blind. Even Kossuth and Mazzini, not to speak of Ronge, are hailed as welcome helpers in what is felt to be thus a common cause; and Red Republicanism grows respectable, as it is heard blaspheming the Pope. *That* merit is allowed to cover almost any quantity of sins besides. Conducted in such temper, the war runs every where

into ecclesiastical monstrosities and contradictions, overturning in a wholesale way in one direction the very interests which it pretends to uphold in another.

When we are taxed with refusing to succumb to the dictation of this fanatical and tyrannical school, we very readily admit the truth of the charge. We do not hold the Papacy, as such, to be Antichrist. There have been, we doubt not at all, many godly and pious Popes. We do not believe, that the Catholic Church was the synagogue of Satan, for more than a thousand years before the rise of Luther, and that the only true succession of Christianity lay all that time among miserable sects on the outside of it. We are not willing to bastardize Protestantism itself, by making the Roman baptism from which it springs to be but a baptism of the Devil, unchurching thus at the same time with a single stroke the whole Christianity of the middle ages, and of the ages before away back to the days of Cyprian and Tertullian. We do not feel bound at all, to follow implicitly the sense which Dr. Berg is pleased to put into two or three Bible texts, *against* the authority of Grotius, Hammond, Hengstenberg and Stuart, and we know not how many great Protestant critics besides. It is no part of our religion to hate and curse Catholics, to lampoon their priesthood, to make a mock of their worship, to treat their holy things with scorn and contempt. We have read too much church history, and looked too widely into the present state of the world, for that. This moderation may be very unpalatable to Dr. Berg, and the school to which he belongs. But we cannot help it. Such is the state of our mind. We are not now asserting it however as necessarily right. That is not really the point at issue. The question is only, whether it be an offence against Protestant orthodoxy to think in this way. That is what Dr. Berg maintains. It is not with him a matter of freedom, to differ here from the rule to which he is himself so unhappily sworn. He lays it down as a foundation *principle*, that Rome is Antichrist, Babylon, and Amalek, that the Pope is officially the Man of Sin, that Mede's key to the prophecies is infallibly true, that Popery has been from first to last "the master-piece of Satan," (casting out devils, it would seem, through Beelzebub, the prince of the devils.) This, we are told, is the only theory by which Protestantism can stand. It must pass for a term of orthodoxy, an article of faith. Since when, however, we ask in reply, has any such narrow and inquisitorial rule been in force? By what ecclesiastical Star Chamber was it established? In what Draconian code is it now to be found? When, where, and how, especially,

has the German Reformed Church erected any test of this sort, to bind the conscience of her ministers, either in Europe or in this country? The test is arbitrary altogether, an imposition smuggled in privily to subvert "the liberty which we have in Christ Jesus," and to "bring us into bondage." We disown it; we give no place to it by subjection, not even for an hour; that the truth of the gospel may remain without damage and harm. We deny the right of any man, or any set and party of men, to frame rules and constitutions for us in this high-handed autocratic and overbearing style. Those who choose to make a large part of their religion consist in abusing and slandering Romanism, are at liberty of course for themselves to indulge as far as they please their own malevolent taste; and there is nothing to hinder them either from doing what they can, by rant and slang, to make others of the same mind. But let them stick to such moral suasion. When they mount the tripod, and claim to be oracles, and affect to launch thunderbolts, making their miserable hobbies articles of faith, and then denouncing as heretics all who refuse to take up the same song, it is high time to let them know that they are driving things quite too fast and too far. Whatever may come of them hereafter, their hobbies are *not yet* fully installed, for universal Protestantism, oracles and articles of faith.

So much for the burden of Dr. Berg's Farewell Words, as directed immediately against ourselves. We are now ready for the consideration of it, as a cry against the German Reformed Church. That of course is the main end of the whole proclamation. It is intended to be an apology, as we have seen, for an act of revolutionary secession. Dr. Berg wishes to play martyr. He claims to be a seceder for conscience' sake. This involves necessarily the idea of an issue with the whole body, which he is led thus heroically to forsake. To make out his case, it is not enough to muster charges, like those we have just been considering, against one man or another singly taken; that would be a poor reason for so big a step; it must be contrived in some way to give the matter a far more general character, and to bring in the whole church as *particeps criminis*, party to the alleged offence. Only in that form do we get at last a *nodus vindice dignus*, full opportunity and fit occasion for such a Samson Agonistes to put forth all his strength.

"I may declare," says the late Race Street Pastor, "that I have made the sacrifice, which I offer this evening, for the sake of principle." Again, (p. 7): "These familiar faces, this pulpit, this Bible, the tones of that noble organ, the songs of

Zion, and all that is identified with them during the scenes of my ministry, are written indelibly upon my heart; time cannot efface them; and yet, I declare before you all, none of these things move me, in comparison with the principles which demand that I should sacrifice them all. Upon that altar, inscribed Jehovah-Nissi, I would lay them; and to that blessed Lord who gave them, I here surrender all I have and all I am, for the maintenance of these principles, until He demands the record of my stewardship. Jehovah is my banner!" This is the language of a man, brought into great and sore straits for what he takes to be the truth. It puts one in mind of Huss, Luther, Hugh Latimer, or John Knox. The meaning is, without stilt: "You see in me, good people, a great and glorious confessor and martyr; who to save his faith, is forced to tear himself away from a fond and pleasant settlement, and go on hard pilgrimage to Gibraltar. The German Reformed Church has persecuted me into this cruel *sacrifice*, by exacting from me terms of communion to which as an honest man I have found it impossible to submit. I am a victim for righteousness' sake!" Such is the general charge; which is then made however still more direct and precise. "It would be a task utterly beyond my strength and your patience," the libel runs, (p. 9.), "to sketch the details of the developments of the last seven years of the history of the German Reformed Church. You know, that I protested against them in their incipency. And I remember with gratitude the cordiality with which this congregation sustained me, when I stood in the painful position of recording my vote in solitary opposition, without a single voting ministerial associate to keep me in countenance, against the overwhelming odds by which the new doctrines were sustained." And so again, more solemnly still (p. 22.): "The Church of the German Reformation I do love in my inmost soul. If I had not loved the Church, I would have held my peace, and not sacrificed my comfort for the sake of doctrinal differences. I say it not boastfully, but still I will say it, if there is a minister in the German Reformed Church who has done more, or suffered more, during the last seven years, for the sake of these principles, I do not know him. Brethren, I know the ordeal through which I must pass, both among friends and foes. I feel that my position is painful, but I am sure in my own mind that it is right. I cannot co-operate with the Synod of the German Reformed Church. Its late action is a practical avowal of sympathy with views which I cannot endure, and subsequent developments have satisfied me that my mission in its communion is fulfilled."

All this is designed to be in a sort of modest parallelism with the relation of Elijah to Israel, in the days of Ahab and Queen Jezebel. The German Reformed Church answers to the Ten Tribes, gone or fast going after Baal. Dr Berg is the solitary Tishbite under the juniper tree.

But what now has the Church been doing, to drive this new prophet from her bosom? Has she undertaken to change the Heidelberg Catechism? Has she pretended to bring in new articles of faith? Has she trampled in any direction on the rights of conscience? Has she required Dr. Berg to give up any opinion, or to accept any opinion, contrary to his own sense of truth and duty? Has he been subjected to impositions or restraints in any way, in the exercise of his ministry? What *principles* has he been called upon to sacrifice. What disabilities, what penalties and pains, has he found himself compelled to brave, in carrying out his mission in his own way? Those who plead for the sacred right of secession, in such a case, take the ground commonly that there must be a real compulsion of some sort to make it right. Mere corruption in a church is not of itself enough to justify such revolutionary violence. There must be palpable opposition to the truth, virtually *forcing* its witnesses to withdraw. Has there been any such cause for secession in the present case?

Nothing of the sort is pretended. The German Reformed Church never made more account of her Catechism, than she does at this time. She has passed no act, which by any construction can be resolved into an imposition of new articles of belief; no act that can be said so much as to sanction in form the particular points even on which this complaint of Dr. Berg is made to hinge. Right or wrong, they have never been enforced by any ecclesiastical legislation. What hurts the tender conscience of Dr. Berg, is not that he has been required to yield here to the mind of others, but that others have not been forced to yield to *his* mind. He leaves the Church, not for what it has done, but for what it has refused to do, in the way of intolerance and persecution. It is a sacrifice for bad humor's sake, more than for the sake of a good conscience.

It is now a number of years since Dr. Berg first put himself forward publicly, in opposition to the Mercersburg Professors. The occasion was the publication of Dr. Schaff's tract, entitled the *Principle of Protestantism*. The character of this able production is now well known. It seeks to place the cause of the Reformation on solid and sure ground, by defending it from the charge of revolutionary radicalism, and asserting its

right to be considered a legitimate result of the previous history of the Church. This involves of course the acknowledgment of a true historical succession of Christianity, in the bosom of the Papacy during the middle ages; a thought directly at war with the fond conceit of those, who make Popery *per se* the "Master-piece of the Devil." It was resolved accordingly to crush Mercersburg. By a wise regulation in the constitution of the Seminary, it is provided that charges against a Theological Professor must be brought first before the Board of Visitors, by a responsible accuser and in a precise form, with notice and copy duly furnished, sometime beforehand, to the party accused; and only after there is found to be cause for them by the Board of Visitors, can they come regularly before the Synod. Such equity however suited not the prosecution, of which we now speak. Its policy was to rouse popular odium, and overwhelm its victim without a regular trial. With the help of the Helffenstein family, Dr. Berg got a vote of the small Classis of Philadelphia, calling upon the Synod to try, not Dr. Schaff, but his book, for the purpose of seeing whether it did not teach certain vague specifications of false doctrine. No process could well be more irregular. The Synod however at its meeting in York, most indulgently waived the question of order, and allowed the prosecution to go forward in this most irresponsible form. An examination *was* instituted. Dr. Berg was heard as prosecuting attorney, to his own heart's content. The end is well known. The Synod did not pretend to endorse the book; the case called for nothing of that sort; but it was solemnly declared, that no cause was found in it for the accusations of the Philadelphia Classis, or of the clique rather which then acted in its name. The decision was the next thing to unanimous. The only ministerial vote recorded against it, his own mouth being witness, was that of Dr. Berg himself, who as grand inquisitor and prosecuting plaintiff had in truth no business to vote at all.

This took place in 1845. Since that time, Dr. Berg, encouraged and supported by the Helffenstein family, has repeatedly tried to bring one or other of the professors, or both of them together, to some sort of trial before the Synod; first at Carlisle in 1846; then at Lancaster in 1847; then at Martinsburg in 1850; and then again at Lancaster in 1851. In no case, however, has he condescended to take the proper constitutional course for reaching his end; not even after this was pointed out to him in the plainest terms, as indispensably necessary to the allowance of any farther prosecution. The Synod, he was told, had yielded this point once, (unwisely perhaps,) but would not

do it again. But the constitutional rule was not to his taste. It had its difficulties. It involved too much responsibility. His plan was rather to agitate, to deal in loose charges and popular declamation before the world, to get up a pressure on the outside of the church, to create a faction within, to make capital for this out of every new trouble that might arise, no matter from what quarter, and so to carry his object finally by violent assault. For years, he has kept up this dishonorable course, doing as much as in him lay to break down the credit of the institutions at Mercersburg, and to embarrass the professors in their work. Year after year, pains have been taken to have it noised abroad that they were to be brought to account, on charges which there was no resolution to put into distinct shape, or to urge in a lawful and manly way; and then when these rumours came to nothing, the Synod was blamed for not allowing the investigation to go forward. We doubt if there ever was a more flagrant system of schismatical agitation, so patiently borne with for the like length of time by any ecclesiastical body. When we consider the comparatively small strength of the church, and the unfavorable influences which have been constantly at work in the spirit of surrounding denominations, the only wonder is that this guerilla warfare has not long since proved triumphantly successful by bringing all the operations of the church to a dead stand. And yet it is of his untiring zeal in such bad form for such iniquitous end, that Dr. Berg is only too modest now *not to boast*, as an argument of his doing and suffering more for the German Reformed Church, during the last seven years, than any other minister in her communion! If he could have blown up her institutions altogether, and demolished half her altars by dissension and schism, the martyr-prophet might have considered his glory complete. No wonder that such a man should wish to blot the very idea of schism, "that word which has so often been the catchword of spiritual despotism," from the ecclesiastical vocabulary.

At the last meeting of the Synod in Lancaster, the old game was renewed again, under what were deemed to be the most favorable auspices, and with the most buoyant hopes of success. Six months before, the senior professor in the Seminary had tendered his resignation to the Board of Visitors, a measure towards which he had been openly moving for a whole year before. Afterwards, when the first article on Early Christianity appeared and created some talk, it was industriously reported on the outside, that the resignation was on account of reigning dissatisfaction in the church. Had there been any ground for prosecution,

the way was still open for Dr. Berg, and his staff, to undertake it in regular and right method, by tabling distinct charges before the Board of Visitors, and so bringing the case in the end, under due responsibility, into open Synod. Nothing of this sort however was done. The plan was rather, as on other occasions, to make a noise, get up an excitement, and then come down on the case with a sort of mob judgment, when the Synod was in session. On the question of receiving our resignation, it was proposed to intervene suddenly by some act that might amount to a general censure, without the formality of a trial. The Rev. Jacob Helffenstein, in particular, showed a very fierce, nay, even rabid, desire to go into a declamatory assault and battery on the spot, as though the party to be crushed had been already arraigned in fact, convicted and condemned. Every one can see, that it would have been the height of injustice, to have yielded to such irregular prosecution in any way. With great dignity accordingly, the Synod refused to allow any such declamatory assault and battery in its presence; and just because such an unrighteous effort had been made to load the resignation with an *ex post facto* sense, which did not belong to it in its own proper form, it was resolved farther almost unanimously not to accept it at the time, but to throw it entirely on the will of the professor to take such course in regard to it afterwards as to himself might seem best. Such generous and noble regard for justice, however, proved sorely displeasing to the unrighteous persecution whose purposes it served to disappoint and defeat. Mr. Helffenstein at once appealed to the unchurchly and anti-popery spirit of other sects, boldly and *falsely* declaring that the G. R. Synod had made itself responsible for all our published views; and that these views included all the "gorgons, hydras, and chimeras dire," which he himself saw fit to hallucinate into them, in his twofold capacity of judge and jury. The representation, we say very deliberately, was *false*, though cordially echoed by many of our evangelical papers throughout the land. No such points, as it alleged, were ever brought before the Synod. There was no trial; no arraignment; nobody to acquit or condemn; no vote that looked towards the determination of any theological question; no question of that sort at all under consideration. Dr. Berg himself, at the time, knew very well that the action of the Synod was not to be taken in this way. When Mr. Helffenstein rose in a pet, and made a pitiful threat of secession, the Race Street pastor promptly disclaimed every thought of this sort. He was resolved, as all along before, to remain in the church, of whose treatment he felt that he had

no cause to complain. So in the next number of the Protestant Quarterly, he very distinctly defended the Synod from the false sense put upon its action by his intemperate companion in arms, and expressed his full determination to be if possible the leader of a revolutionary party in its bosom. But now, all at once, the aspect of things is changed. The Helffensteins continue dutifully in their place; while Dr. Berg takes up the very lie he formerly disowned, makes the action of the last Synod to have been at once judicial and legislative, charges it accordingly before high heaven with wholesale heresy, and affects to leave it with violent secession as a martyr, fairly driven from its bosom for conscience' sake.

To cover this huge inconsistency, it is insinuated that new occasion has been given since the meeting of Synod for the act now perpetrated. "Subsequent developments have satisfied me," he says, "that my mission in its communion is fulfilled." What are these developments? We are not told. One main cause of offence might seem to be gone. The professorship which *we* once filled is vacant. Our resignation was carried into full effect, as originally proposed, before the tocsin of the Protestant Quarterly was sounded for a combination to oust us by main force. We know of no other developments, except the completion of our articles on Early Christianity, and the fact that his tocsin cry for a revolutionary convention found notwithstanding no favor, but was met rather on all sides, as it deserved to be, with silent indignation and contempt. Are these the ominous events, that have satisfied Dr. Berg at last that the G. R. Church "is no longer his home?" So really it would seem.

We see here the true nature of this whole issue. The other points of accusation, in our case, are merely by the way. The grand cause of offence is, that we are not willing to hate and curse Romanism in the usual anti-popery style, and that we dare to call in question the enormous falsehoods, both exegetical and historical, on which this system of outrageous hatred is built. Our articles on Early Christianity are charged with being an assault on Protestantism, which the Church was bound to rebuke. They in reality show only that Early Christianity back to the middle of the second century was something materially different from modern Protestantism, and closely related to the Catholicism of later times; a *fact*, which Dr. Berg himself has not pretended latterly to deny, and on which we hope to shed additional light hereafter in our articles on Cyprian. But this fact in the end makes it necessary to acknowledge a true historical succession of Christianity in the Roman Church, for the

rational vindication of Protestantism itself. Dr. Berg, as we have seen, stands violently committed to the unhistorical hypothesis, by which the Papacy *per se* is held to be Antichrist, and the church of the middle ages the synagogue of Satan; and like this school in general, he has no power to tolerate any view different from his own. We have openly resisted the authority of every such hypothesis as an article of faith, and have chosen to construe history in some harmony with our Saviour's promise, that the gates of hell should never prevail against his church. In our articles on Early Christianity, we have taken pains to say very distinctly, that we do not own the anti-popery scheme to which Dr. Berg is sworn, as any part whatever of the proper orthodoxy of the German Reformed Church. This declaration of independence formed in his eyes the climax of offence. His whole position required, that the Church should visit it with indignant rebuke. The Church however has refused to acknowledge or sustain his position, in any such proscriptive way. Ten years ago, when he tried to get a vote of Synod declaring Roman baptism invalid, his motion was laid under the table; but the course of things lately has amounted to a still more distinct and unmistakeable intimation, that the genius of the G. R. Church is in no harmony with radicalism of this sort, and that it is not likely soon to brook the servile yoke of any such foreign and miserably narrow tradition. This is a rebuke for Dr. Berg. He feels it severely. It has touched his pride, and so his conscience. For years he has been laboring to inoculate the G. R. Church with the virus of his own fanaticism; and now this is the end of it. His labor has come to nothing. He finds his zeal foiled, his ambition defeated. Othello's occupation is gone, his "*mission*" is fulfilled." The Church "is no longer his home." He does accordingly the best he can; makes a merit of valorously forsaking its communion, and endeavours to carry away with him the laurels of a great and glorious martyr. *Requiescat in pace!*

J. W. N.

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1852.

VOL. IV.---NO. IV.

THE DOCTRINE OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM,
AND
THE BAPTISTIC QUESTION.

By DR. H. MARTENSEN, *Prof. of Theology in the University of Copenhagen.*

This is a small work of 81 pages, part of which is here presented to the English reader—the remainder shall follow. The occasion and design of it, will be best understood from the Author's own words in a short preface. "The by no means unimportant baptistic movement in the Danish Church—a movement which has not yet run its whole course—is the direct occasion of this church pamphlet. Inasmuch as the Baptistic Theory has manifested itself also, in many points, in the Evangelical Church of Germany, and has become matter of attention, the author hopes that this small work may also be of interest to German readers. It asks to be permitted to take its place among those contributions, which have already appeared that are designed to lead to a more definite understanding of the dogmatic substance of this matter." It will be easily seen that

VOL. IV.—NO. IV. 20 •

it suits equally well the theological meridian of the American Church. It leads forth a host against the Baptist Theory, from a point which is comparatively new in American polemics; and the controverted system must marshal an entirely different set of arguments if it would keep its ground. Our own comments on its merits must be reserved to the close of the translation. It may only yet be necessary to remind the reader that the author is a Lutheran. If the doctrine of the tract is true Lutheranism, it will be seen that it differs, in its theory of Christianity, as far from what goes under that name in this country, as it does from the Baptist theory itself. Without any farther preliminary observations we commend this treatise to the theological times, as a little book to be desired to make one think, if not even to make one wise.

Introduction.

The inquiry whether the baptism of infants can be dogmatically justified, has, through the baptistic movement, become matter of special attention; the more so, since views begin to appear in the bosom of the church itself, which, however much they seem to be opposed to the Baptist system in a civil and moral point of view nevertheless share with it dogmatically in the same principle. The baptistic rejection of infant baptism rests upon the view, that baptism has significance merely as a free self-conscious act, as in baptism of adults, who have previously been regenerated and are believers, in whose case baptism is only an outward sensible demonstration of the inward gift of grace, of which the subject has become partaker in another way independent of baptism. A self-conscious personal life of faith, received immediately and direct from the operations of the Holy Ghost in the soul, is, to the baptistic system the very germ and substance of Christianity, while it views the Sacraments as mere symbolical signs and adumbrations. Although this view comes most easily into favor through the Reformed Church, in its views of the relation of faith to the sacraments, yet the one-sided prominence of mere subjective and purely personal Christianity, has for some time past also found entrance into the Lutheran church. The manner of thinking which has been extended through Pietism as well as by Rationalism, has generated views of the church and of the means of grace, which have not only prepared the way for the Baptist theory, but carry the germ of this in their own bosom. If we

turn our attention towards the Protestant sermons of the latest time, from which the reigning doctrine is necessarily reflected, we shall find historical ground for the assertion that the significance of Baptism has been handled prevailingly with reference to its subjective side, while its objective side, that which is properly Sacramental, has been left in the back ground. Infant baptism, as such, upon the whole, has been handled with a certain reserve and caution, only in a passing way alluded to from some subordinate point of view, but not proclaimed as carrying with it the unconditional necessity of an article of faith. As, agreeable to the reigning views, free personal conviction seemed to be the first foundation for the evolution of the Christian life in the individual, it was natural that confirmation should be overvalued at the expense of infant baptism. Baptism, as infant Baptism, seemed placed in an oblique position in relation to faith, since it was presumed that a well grounded faith alone could give the subject of it a right to baptism; hence baptism seemed more appropriately joined with confirmation as its seal. This apprehension of the nature of Baptism is without dispute baptistic, and hence the baptistic system is associated with a onesidedness which may be designated in general as having forgotten what religion presupposes and by what it is conditioned, in its zeal for free self-conscious religion. In the baptistic system, however, this onesidedness appears in its most destructive form, inasmuch as it breaks formally with the church, and thus withdraws itself schismatically from all reforming conservative influence. It seeks to secure its error, by separating it from the great stream of historical development, and preserving it in a permanent form by an isolated church-communion. But just in this very way it places itself, as far as possible, beyond all means of correction. Instead of suffering itself, and its subjective Christianity, to be taken up in the general flow of church life, and in this way to penetrate through to the truth, it must now sooner or later pass over into the list of historical petrifications.

The point at which this sect is joined in agreement with the true church, is its consciousness of sin and need of grace, its belief in regeneration by the Spirit of God, its workings towards sanctification; but, with foolish trust in her own superior wisdom, the daughter has separated herself from the mother-church, vainly imagining that she can complete her own sanctification in her own strength, independently of that which must previously be at hand in the order of Christian life. And so far does she go in her fanaticism, that rejecting infant baptism, she

openly denies the mother. For this reason the whole of this singular controversy between the church and the baptistic system, hinges substantially upon this point. It is a controversy between mother and daughter in regard to the birth and proper beginning of the Christian life: whether the new created consciousness comes to life through the medium of a *generatio æquivoca*, or whether it has a regular mother. The question in other words, is this: Is faith the first, the original; baptism the second, the derivative; or whether the reverse is not rather the case, viz: that faith is the fruit of baptism, and hence presupposes baptism: whether it should be said that the baptism of adults is the true regular baptism, and that infant baptism can not be dogmatically maintained, or whether it ought much rather be said that infant baptism is the true orderly baptism, and that the baptism of adults, when regarded dogmatically, is to be viewed as an exception to the rule, hence in substance as an infant baptism. Precisely with a view of giving a more particular answer to this question, have these pages been written. We designate the object of our investigation more nearly to be, to set ourselves right in regard to the fundamentals which the believing consciousness presupposes—those presuppositions, without which no regenerated consciousness is possible—and to recognize or designate infant baptism as the plenary point of these presupposed fundamentals. And, as the doctrine of infant baptism evidently belongs more immediately to the third article of faith, viz: to that of the Spirit, it must nevertheless, at the same time, be placed in organic union with the articles of the Father and the Son, in order that the reigning onesidedness may be counteracted in its ground; in other words: Infant baptism must not only be viewed in its connection with the operations of grace, but at the same time also, with the election of grace or predestination, and with the personal revelation of grace in Christ. That the doctrine of election has an inward connection with the doctrine of baptism, is already evident from the great significance which the first doctrine has with the Baptists, when these have reached only to some measure of development in doctrines. That the doctrine of the person of Christ stands connected with baptism is a fact of which all are conscious; but the principal thing is, that this connection be felt to be not merely an apparent one, but a real one. And, as these several factors or forces—eternal election, the manifestation of Christ, the outpouring of the Spirit, and the operations of grace,—are bound together in one living organic unity in the idea of the CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH, we shall, in our attempt

to point out the relation of baptism to this idea of the Church, reach the comprehensive stand-point from which we shall be able to give to each of these several factors or forces its truth, and assign to it its proper bounds.

I. Baptism as a Church-founding Sacrament.

Faith alone saves us; not dead, but living faith—not foreign but individual, personal faith. To have faith is the same as to have assurance of salvation—it is the same as to have eternal life, as well present as future. But just for the very reason that faith includes in itself an eternity, it can have no temporal, contingent or accidental source; it must have a divine foundation. On this account Christian faith must regard itself as a work of divine grace. Divine grace is made known and apprehended, not only in the advent of the Saviour into the world, it is equally as much apprehended in the gift to man of faith in the Saviour. For, to use an expression of Luther, a Christian knows that he cannot, by his own power, or through his own reason, come to his Lord and Saviour. If he comes to his Saviour, it is because his Saviour has first come to him; is he to apprehend Christ, then he must first be apprehended of Christ. Hence, although faith is in one respect the freest and most personal of all acts—that which is in the deepest sense human—it nevertheless has not its deepest ground in human personality and freedom. For this reason consequently the believing personality, in the Scriptures, is designated as a new creature; by which it is declared that the Christian lives his life of faith not from himself, but that this life is something given, something derived, something imparted.

If now the question is asked in what way faith is wrought in the heart, the best answer seems to be this: That it arises through the operation of the Holy Ghost in the inward man by means of Christian preaching. "Faith cometh by hearing," says the Apostle Paul; and upon this passage the Baptists ground their argument that baptism is only to follow faith as an outward rite. In order, therefore, that faith may be generated in the human heart, it is only necessary to have a preacher who has himself been apprehended of Christ, in whose inward man the Christian life of faith is active, and who by his personal testimony is able to waken up that life in his hearers. While we acknowledge the full weight and force of the above apostolic declaration, we will show that this declaration, is, by the

Baptists, perverted into an untruth ; because it is only true after certain other truths which are presupposed by it, which truths, however, the Baptists do not acknowledge.

We ask here if faith comes from preaching, whence does preaching itself come? Is christian preaching merely the private communication of one individual to another in regard to his christian frame or condition, or in regard to his inward dispositions or spiritual emotions? Is it a mere private undertaking when one goes forth to preach the gospel? All sects profess that they come not in their own name, but in the name of Christ, and that every preacher must be conscious of a call, of a mission and commission. The christian preacher must, therefore, recognize himself as the organ of Christ, as one who has a function to fulfil in the name of Christ. But how can he be the organ of Christ, unless he has previously been incorporated into the ORGANISM of Christ, that is, the church? Christ stands related to the individual only through the general; and every true fellowship with Him, is a fellowship with him only as the HEAD of the body—that is, of the Church. True preaching can, therefore, only be that, which proceeds from Christ through the Church. The Christian preacher is only he, IN WHOM THE CHURCH IS GROUNDED; and his preaching, in so far as it is directed to those who do not belong to Christ, can only have for its object, *to found the Church in them.*

When we say that no preacher can be the organ of Christ, who is not at the same time an organ of the Church, we have not in our mind, in making this assertion, a definite spiritual ORDER or RANK, to whom the act of Christian preaching should alone and exclusively be reserved ; we recognize the Protestant idea of the universal priesthood of Christians ; we accord to every Christian the right to testify of his faith, only it must be laid down as a universal requirement, that no one put himself forward as a private organ of Christ, but that he speak forth from out the communion-life which has been founded in Christ, and which has been developed in history. The error of the sects consists precisely in this, that they would unite themselves with Christ without the Church, the great historical medium. In this system the individual stands only in a private relation to Christ, after he has reached this position through a purely inward and mystical moving of the Spirit, or through his own reading and understanding of the Bible. It is religious sympathy alone, which draws individuals together in a conventicle for mutual communication and interchange of personal experiences. To them preaching proceeds only from individuals, not from the

Church. For they do not view the Church as *preceding* the individual, but regard it only as result, as *product* of the holy struggles of the individual. The sects would form the whole, by an atomistic bringing together of the parts; while it is the very secret of an organism, that the whole precedes the parts, therefore the *communion* of saints must precede, in order, the individual saints. Instead of viewing the Church as the holy mother of faith, and as the body of the individual members, the sects regard her exclusively as a product, an off-spring of faith, and of the body of individuals.

Is, therefore, faith to arise, not by a *generatio aequivoca*, but in an organic manner, then the principle that faith comes from preaching, must be more particularly qualified thus: It comes from that preaching which goes out from the Church, and which invites men into the Church. When Christian preaching calls Jews and Gentiles into the Church, it is only done in order that they may there attain to the true *beginning* of faith—to that beginning which is, at the same time, the *principle*, the inward life-bearing possibility, from which a progressive evolution and growth in Christ shall proceed. That beginning of faith, which can find place in the individual before he is incorporated into the Church, is only a preliminary, a preparatory beginning, which is, in and for itself, an unfruitful and powerless beginning, and one which contains in itself no guarantee for its actual continuation, for its true progression. The individual who stands out of the Church, can, so to say, merely make a religious onset, can only impel himself towards the kingdom of God in a kind of infinite approach, without ever actually, in this way, getting into it. The *true* beginning of faith is effected alone in this, that the movement does not proceed from the individual, but that the Church secures to itself a beginning in the individual, that the great communion life implants itself into the individual life. When we say that the beginning of faith is planted in the individual by the Church being planted in him, or by the individual being appropriated by the Church, we wish nevertheless to be understood to say, that this beginning is only the true beginning of faith, in so far, as the Church is itself appropriated of CHRIST. Only when the proposition, 'The Church gives itself a beginning in the individual,' is resolved and explained by the other, 'Christ, too, gives himself a beginning in the individual, makes him His organ by founding His Church in him'—only then does it designate the correct mode in which true faith has its true beginning.

We here go back, in our consideration, to the idea of the constitution of the Church. That Christ has *constituted* the Church does not merely mean that he has given it an historical beginning in time, but that he has, in time, given it an eternal beginning—that beginning which has secured to the Church an eternal life and an eternal growth, the power of triumphantly unfolding itself to salvation. That Christ has given to his Church this eternal beginning farther includes that he has made himself the *principle* of its spirit—that he, the God-man, the only begotten, in whom dwelt the fullness of the Godhead bodily, has placed himself in an organic relation to his Church, as well to the whole as to each individual member. As founder of his Church, Christ is not merely the subject or object of faith, but he himself is the founder of faith. His Church has not been constituted in an accidental or sporadic way; it is no conventicle of persons who have gathered around Christ, and elected him as Lord and Master, but the Lord himself has elected and prepared for himself his Church. Were faith only grounded in this, namely, that the first disciples gathered around Christ, based their faith upon their own agreement and sympathies with him and each other, and then proclaimed and extended his doctrines from themselves—in that case a religious sect or school would have been established, but no Church. But just as little as Christ appeared as a private individual, just so little is faith in Christ a private matter. And as the appearance of Christ is presupposed by an eternal decree, which was made before the foundation of the world, so also faith in Christ is not a human matter, but the faith of man in Christ is included in the same eternal decree. Christ is only the perfect fulfilment of this eternal decree, in so far as he is not manifested merely as object, but at the same time also as founder of faith. The faith of the Church is, therefore, not only faith in Christ, but faith through Christ and faith by means of Christ. The Church builds the certainty of her eternal election, not upon the purity or strength of her subjective life of faith, which is subject to that which is temporal and contingent, but upon the foundation out of which the subjective life of faith proceeds—upon the constitution of Christ. Not upon her own love to Christ, but upon his previous love to her, she rests the assurance that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her.

If we look back to the time when Christ himself wandered upon earth, we find that the faith of the disciples in him was not brought forth by means of a rational reflection upon his doctrines, which, as is well known, they did not fully compre-

hend, but by means of the theanthropic power of Christ's *personality*, through which he constituted them his own, and prepared them as his organs. It was the personal, loving power of the only begotten, which guaranteed to them the truth of his doctrines; and their confidence in Christ, their assurance that nothing should pluck them out of his hands, sprang not out of the relation in which they, the weak and infantine disciples, has placed themselves to Christ, but out of the relation in which he, the personal grace and truth, had placed himself to them. It was the Lord himself who helped them to faith. For this reason also their Lord and Master, in the consciousness of his divine power, testifies, not, Ye have chosen me, but, I have chosen you! The faith of the disciples was, therefore, in the deepest and purest sense of the word, a faith of authority; because Christ himself was the founder of it. Personal self-consciousness and free faith unfolded itself in them only after the outpouring of the Spirit. The Spirit, however, never ceased to point them back to Christ: freedom ever pointed back to authority—the idea to the fact. This history of the generation of faith, its foundation by Christ, its development from authoritative to free personal faith, which nevertheless still rests upon the fact of its divine constitution, must in substance repeat itself in all following generations, since the order of grace cannot be for them substantially different from what it was to the first disciples. It is this continuation of the order of grace which is wrought by means of holy BAPTISM. What the personal election of Christ was to the first circle of disciples, that Baptism is for the successive Church, the divine fact through which Christ gives to his Church its true and eternal beginning in the individual. For this reason the Apostles of the Lord, in whom he himself personally founded his Church, needed not Baptism; and for this reason the Apostle Paul had to be baptized, because he alone had not been with the Lord in the days of his flesh. By means of Baptism the Church propagates itself from generation to generation, so that every new generation which is added to the Church, is appropriated by Christ in just as primitive a way as were the first disciples, and become partakers of the endless beginning of faith in as fresh and living a way as those first Christians did. For it results from the *Kingly* office of Christ, that he, although he no more goes in a sensible form from Galilee into Judea, nevertheless substantially and personally moves on in the history of the world, from generation to generation, and that he is still, as he was in the beginning, the founder of true faith upon earth. Baptism is

therefore a transaction, not of the absent, but of the present, Christ. It is the *risen* Christ himself, who, in Baptism, extends his arms towards all generations of men with a view of effectuating the decree of the Father, the eternal election—with a view of founding faith, and of imparting the Spirit which proceeds from himself and the Father.

The proposition, that faith comes from preaching, must, agreeably to what these considerations have now developed, be interpreted as meaning that it comes from that preaching which goes out from Baptism and which invites to Baptism. But preaching calls to baptism in order that Christ may found his Church in the single individual—give to the Church an endless beginning in him. That faith comes from preaching is, therefore, by no means irreconcilable with the proposition that *faith comes from Baptism*. It is only the exoteric apprehension of the matter which is here taken up into the esoteric. For, in so far as faith, in a Heathen or Jew, begins through means of preaching, this beginning is only the temporal, finite beginning of faith, which is neither more nor less than the vehicle by which the proper central beginning, which carries in its bosom the plenary promise of the future, is introduced. Everywhere in the Kingdom of the Spirit, everywhere, where reference is made to spiritual productiveness, we can discern this twofold beginning—the relative, which is only of a preparatory nature, and the central, having life powers and being really creative. In the language of the world the central is called the generative beginning, because it is not the subject which by way of inclination moves itself towards the idea, but is the idea itself, the thing itself, which itself, in its individual fulness, takes a living energetic beginning in the subject, and opens in him the source of spiritual animation, the mystery of productiveness. The generative consists not in this, that the individual elects for itself its own idea, but in this that the idea elects the individual as its own organ. That individual which seeks to elect his own idea, without having been elected of the idea, is either fanatical or rationalistic. What the generative beginning, which may easily be present without the individual having a clear consciousness of it, is in the sphere of human activity for that individual who has a special mission to fulfil: that Baptism is for the sphere of the christian religion, in its reference to the fundamental problem of human life. For it is the Church-forming Christ himself, the principle, which includes in itself the whole fulness of Church-life, which here constitutes the generative power of the individual. In so far as faith comes from the word preach-

ed, it is partly only the preliminary unproductive faith, and partly that which follows and is active in the Church; in either case it is that faith which comes forward in time and experience. The MYSTERY of faith, however, its endless foundation, originates from the election of Christ in Baptism, while he, as Head of the Church, places himself in an organic relation to the individual, and in this way, opens to him the source from which alone faith can be developed, and from which alone Christian life and productiveness flow. Hence Christian preaching rests upon the fact that there is a Christian Baptism—that the Church is founded, and is ever being founded anew in unregenerated men. Without Baptism, preaching would be only a subjective function, a mere conventicle business, which does not unfold itself out of the act of Christ. It would be, at best, only a work of accidental power a work effected by Scriptural wisdom, or by some indefinite spiritual movements, but not a work of that Spirit which proceeds from the founder of the Church. That we have still at this day evangelical and apostolical preaching, rests not, *most immediately*, upon the apostolic Scriptures, but most directly on this, that we are appropriated of Christ in a way equally original or primitive with the Apostles—that Christ has given us the same beginning of faith, the same source of faith, if not the same measure of the Spirit, as he gave to them, and has, in this way qualified us to perpetuate a communion with the Apostles by means of the holy Scriptures. The conception of Apostolic preaching, according to the Scriptures, can only be determined in connection with the conception of Baptism; and we accordingly find that the office of preaching was instituted at the same time with Baptism. If, now, preaching is to be in the Apostolic spirit, it can assume no other mission than this: partly to lead those, in whom faith is not yet founded, to Baptism; and partly, also, to unfold the mystery of faith in those, in whom it has already secured a ground through the *medium* of Baptism.

The error of the Baptist system consists in this, that it denies the *mystery* of faith, and regards Baptism merely as something to be added to preaching, instead of regarding preaching as unfolding itself upon the ground of Baptism. For this reason the Baptists have no holy office of preacher, such as grounds itself only in the constitution of the Church. Their preaching can only be regarded as the private communication of one individual to another. One individual awakens faith in the other, and by this reciprocal awakening is the Church produced. This awakening is confounded with regeneration, and Baptism

is to follow after only as a declaration—an outward sealing of that regeneration which has already taken place. Nothing *begins* in Baptism, no new evolving principle comes into power. Baptism is merely the outward conclusion of that which is already accomplished within. It is only an act of faith, not an act of Christ. It is the act by which the individual declares that he has elected Christ—through which the congregation declares that it has received the individual: but it is not the creative election of the Lord himself, not the formation of faith by Christ himself.

This error can be traced back to one more general: to this, namely, that it betrays a one-sided conception of the religious *cultus*. The Baptist system goes upon the supposition that *cultus* (worship) is that, in which a man places himself in a relation to God, but overlooks the fact that *cultus* is even so well that in which God places himself in a relation to man; and that this last form of this relation is the deeper of the two—the one in which the first itself has its ground. This one-sided conception is, moreover, considerably spread in the pale of the Church itself, and this shows that the baptistic system is not a phenomenon standing entirely separate and alone. Many members of the Church are under such a conception of the *cultus* that their attendance at church can have, for them, no other meaning than participating in a conventicle constituted by the State. The Church is for them nothing more than a pious convocation for the purpose of mutual edification. They collect around a preacher whose religious individuality pleases them, but the idea of a holy preaching-office, and of the Sacraments, has for them lost its signification. They hold literally that *cultus* means *service* of God; and therefore they regard God exclusively as object—as object of the religious acts of men, without remembering that man can make God the object of his *cultus* only so far as God himself cultivates man. In consequence of this view the congregation seeks to raise itself in devotion to God, hears a sermon about God, but God himself, is, in the whole *cultus*, represented as unproductive; he only receives the offerings of the spirit, without himself giving, acting, working. In so far as, in their *cultus*, God is set forth as active, it is only through the indefinite representations of the divine Spirit, who is present in the human consciousness, in the feelings, and in the believing disposition; but Christ, the centrality of religion, is only regarded as the remembered object.

If however, Christ is to be more than the historical promulgator of a principle, which, after his departure, is to unfold itself,

he must rather be considered as the unseen Head, who stands related to the Church as his mystical Body—as the personal mediator between God and the race, from whom the Church must ever anew receive the Spirit; thus he cannot be regarded merely as the object of cultus for his church, but rather he must be viewed as the eternal and constant founder of this cultus, who never ceases to *officiate* in his church. We must have in view not only an objective Christ, but a living, ever-present, subjective Christ. Precisely this is the conception of the Kingly Christ, the fundamental mystery upon which the church rests, namely, that the separation, of which the senses can take cognizance, existing between this and the future life, is already taken up, or superseded through communion with him who is the personal centre in the whole sphere of personality, and who has promised to be not far from his disciples, who can be one only *in him*.¹ As Head of his Body he takes part, in an endless way, in the fortunes and circumstances of his church; and in his creative power he is the all determining, all-pervading central *will* in the whole organism—the principle of the Spirit in the church.¹ Now as certain as the conception of cultus includes the conception of real Christ-functions, so certain does it also give the conception of determinate Christ-acts,—acts which are independent of faith, but through which faith is grounded and unfolded. It is the conception of the SACRAMENTS which meets us here. The Sacraments, which to the outward view, are only emblematic acts of the church, are according to their unseen substance creative and redeeming acts of the risen Christ. It is not merely a holy thought, a divine idea which has enveloped itself in the sacraments; it is a personal WILL—not a representing, but a working will. It is the all-organizing will of Christ, which here reveals itself in its centrality. The Sacrament is not merely a making visible, an explanation, a pledge, of the grace; but, while it is all this, it is at the same time, the real

¹ The more the dogma of the Kingship of Christ, has, in these last times, been neglected, while the dogma of the Spirit has in a one-sided way been made prominent—because it set aside the true way in which Christ must be pre-supposed—the more important are, in our time, such works as Dörner's "History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ." In this work, the apprehension of the Person of Christ, as the God-man HEAD of humanity, is not only in a historical and ethical, but also in a metaphysical and cosmological sense, the leading fundamental thought, which is authenticated scientifically by a consideration, equally thorough and comprehensive, of the christological conceptions which have constituted an epoch in history.

communication of the grace—the communication of that by which alone a life evolution is possible. Of course the Sacraments would be nothing to the church without the revealed, historically attested *word* of God; but, on the other hand, only in the view which presupposes the Sacraments, does the revelation of Christ in his word become more than a past history or a mirror of common thoughts and feelings.

The holy delivery in the word affords us only his *historical* presence, his remembrance, his image; the devotion of the congregation, its feeling and its thoughts, contains only his *mystical* presence in the depths of the soul, by means of the operations of the Spirit; these forms, however, find their living centre, and their higher unity, in the *Sacramental* presence, in which Christ himself, through the medium of his institution, substantially reproduces his historical presence. Should at any time the Sacraments, in their inseparable connection with the word, vanish from the church, then also would the subjective life of faith die out of the church. For, it is through these means of grace that Christ makes himself ever anew the pre-requisite of the life of the Spirit in the church; it is through the medium of these, not only that the Spirit once went forth from Christ—in which case Christ would have been merely the historical instrument of the Spirit—but that the Spirit ever anew goes out from him as from his living source. If the being or essence of the Spirit is designated as action, evolution, process, then it must be said that the Sacraments and the word contain the firm and enduring, namely, the fulness of Christ, out of which the Spirit draws. If the Spirit, in his divine presence in the church, is always bound to a relative historical stage of the development of the church consciousness, then the Sacraments and the word contain the eternal source, the unconditional beginning of all development, as well in the present, as in the future world.

In consequence of the reigning conception in the Protestant church, there is only an *image of Christ*, but no real Christ. The rationalistic conception, which still counts many disciples, would have us believe that Christ ended his functions with his departure from the earth: it surmises that he is perhaps now active upon some other planet, but for his church he lives no more: it regards the Sacraments as sensible means, by which his image is enlivened for the church, and it believes that in this way they continue to exert a moral influence. The later speculative conception, which is not satisfied with a historical relick, teaches that Christ is present in his church as an omnipresent Christ-IDEA, as an universal immanent principle in the

faith and knowledge of the church ; and the kingly office is placed in this, that Christ, having vanished as an individuality, is present in his church as *Spirit*. But as, in this cultus, not only a general relation to the Spirit is to find place, but also a personal relation to the personal Christ, this again can only be a relation to his image, not to Christ himself. For, as fixed personality, he has passed away, and has only a presence with his church as the general Spirit. The higher conception, however, of the kingly office of Christ, which unites and reconciles what is here divided, is the primitive christian conception, according to which Christ, as Head of the Body, as personal prototype of humanity, cannot be separated from his organism, but makes himself present by means of his image, and himself operates *in, with, and under* his institution. That the Lord rose from the dead, means not merely that his individuality evaporated in the universality of the Spirit, but that he, who includes in his individuality the entire fulness of divinity and humanity, has in his operations risen above, and superseded, the limits of time and space. He is lifted up to draw all unto him ; he has ascended above all heavens that he might fill all things. Eph. iv. In his church, spread over the whole earth, the risen Christ makes himself present in a way which is not less objective than was his sensible presence on earth, although it is a veiled, mysterious presence. His earthly appearance, his image in the word, his historical institution, he himself appoints as means for his mysterious operations ; his own historical appearance must become the visible element in which the risen Christ embodies his unseen presence.

The Sacraments are the most holy parts in the christian cultus. The individuality of the minister, which in the publication of the word, preserves an independent significance, here draws back, while the Lord himself officiates as eternal High Priest. With Baptism, as the Sacrament of election, the christian cultus begins, while Christ himself, once for all, prepares man for the true worship. The universal priest-hood arises from Baptism, and only as those who have received this consecration, can they bring to him the sacrifices of the Spirit. As the church-founding Sacrament, Baptism cannot be repeated, while the Lord's Supper, as the Sacrament of renewing and sustaining, must be ever repeated anew. Baptism in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost introduces the natural man into the communion of the triune God. It is the eternal gracious election of the Father which here introduces itself into historical reality through the medium of the Son,

who as mediator, imparts the Spirit. The Son appears here, as everywhere, as the living middle between the Father and the Spirit. His Baptism points back to the eternal decree of the Father, it points with promise to the future, when the fruit of the Spirit shall appear, but it is itself the fruitful germ out of which the growth and evolution emanate.

The position which Baptism takes in the christian cultus, and the relation which exists between Baptism and faith, was seen by Luther with great definiteness and clearness. That Luther knew how to estimate living personal faith, the freedom of a christian man, and the inward testimony of the Spirit, no one will deny. No less, however, did he know how to value that in the church which is independent of faith, and his reformation did not only give new life to free personal christianity, but at the same time he gave also to the church her original pre-supposed Christ in the word and Sacraments, the reality of which does not depend upon faith, as little as the personal appearance of Christ upon earth is to be regarded as the product of the believing church. As he had to remind the Papacy that the Sacraments did not benefit man without the right appropriation of them by faith, so he had to contend for the truth against the fanaticism of mysticism, and the one-sidedness of the understanding, which reigned prominently among the Swiss Reformers, that faith did not create the Sacraments, as little as faith was able to raise up its own Saviour. Luther's view of the relation of faith to the Sacraments can, for this reason, not be fully learned from his controversial writings against Catholicism, which course has of late been too much pursued. In these, where, to him, in opposition to the doctrine of the *opus operatum*, every thing seemed to depend upon contending for the right appropriation of the Sacraments, the stress is necessarily laid chiefly upon faith, and the Sacraments are represented with strong prominence in inseparable union with faith. Just as important, however, was it, in his estimation, to hold fast to the distinction between the Sacraments and faith—to contend for the divine substance of the Sacraments in their independence of the use of them, which is especially carried out in those controversial writings which are directed against the Protestant subjectivity. So, for instance, he contends in those sermons, which in the year 1535, he published in honor of holy Baptism, against the error that Baptism is only a Sacrament in so far as those who receive it have faith. From this error, he says, arises the diffuse and dangerous disputation about infant Baptism, which was stirred up by the Anabaptists, and the strongest argument by which

these fanatics sustain themselves is that they say: You were baptized when you were yet a child, and when you did not yet believe, therefore your Baptism is vain. And now, in showing that the whole confusion, in this article of belief, has its foundation in this, that no distinction is made between the *substance* and the *use* of the Sacraments, he lays down the rule: These two, Baptism and Faith, ought to be separated as far as heaven and earth, God and man, are separated.¹ For what God does is firm, sure, and unchangeable, as he himself is unchangeable and eternal; but what we do is unstable and insecure as we ourselves are, so that we can found or build nothing thereon. In order now that our Baptism may stand and be sure to us, he has not founded it upon our faith, because this is uncertain, yea, it may be even false, but he has grounded it upon his word, and upon his own institution, that it may stand and not become weaker even when we have not faith. Whoever, therefore, will be undeceived let him hold to this doctrine, that he may say understandingly and with discrimination: That I am baptized is not my work, neither is it the work of the priest who gave me Baptism, for it is not my Baptism, nor the priest's, nor any other man's, but the Baptism of Christ my Lord; and the Baptism of the Lord needs neither my purity and holiness nor yours, for neither I nor any man is to sanctify and hallow Baptism, but we all are to be purified and made holy through it. For this reason I will not ground Baptism upon my faith, but just the reverse, my faith will I found and build upon my Baptism.²

Lancaster, Pa.

H. H.

¹ Walch X, 2579.

² Walch X, 2582.

PRINCIPLES OF ECCLESIASTICAL UNITY.

The following communication comes from a respected minister of the Episcopal Church, in the State of New-York. It is hardly necessary to say, that the conductors of the Review do not make themselves responsible at all for the writer's opinions. It is enough, that the subject is felt to be one of cardinal interest, and that it is treated in an earnest and honorably candid way.

APRIL 10th 1852.

Rev'd and dear Sir :

I forward, for your perusal and frank opinion, some reflections on the question of Ecclesiastical Unity, which have already had sufficient introduction in a former communication. The occasion of sending them reminds me to express,—though I can do it but too briefly,—my sense of personal obligation to yourself and Dr. Schaff, for not a little impulsion to thought, ascribable to some of your writings, respectively.

I remain,

Rev'd and dear Sir,
Very faithfully Your's,

* *

The Rev'd Dr. NEVIN.

CAN the visible Church be a sectarian community? There may no doubt be a sectarian character imparted to it, through a contracted spirit of legislation in past times, even if no present member of it is sectarian in spirit. If, on the other hand, the Church is quite free from such legislation, and from the character thus derived, it may yet be composed of persons for the most part sectarian in their sentiments.

Whatever stand-point is taken,—whether that which is commonly designated as the High church view of faith in the Church, or whatever other position,—the perspective from it is not such as satisfies the present writer of the freedom of any ecclesiastical organization, or of any church-party within it (that he has any knowledge of) from sectarianism in its constitution. This very consideration, so far from tempting a spirit of censure, rather suggests how inapposite it would be; for however free from a sectarian *spirit* one may believe himself to be, a knowledge of the atmosphere that he breathes ought to warn him of his liability to implication in a sectarian *policy*. Such a policy may insensibly find place in relation to any ecclesiastical or religious matter. As associated with the *Church-question*, it appears to consist mainly, in a demand of more than is neces-

sary or expedient from the consent of others, as a condition of communion with them.

Let it be *assumed* that none of the Christian Confessions of Faith have been doctrinally in error ; but, that the visible Church is comprised within the range of one, or a certain number, of ecclesiastical organizations. There are probably no persons who, whatever may be their idea of the Church, as associated with such and such communions, have any doubt that the grace of God—of that nature which morally qualifies the soul in this life for a state of blessedness hereafter—is possessed by very many who are not within the Church as the former may understand it. And this spiritual phenomenon is explained by them, not without charity (in the popular sense of the term,) in this manner,—that God has dispensed *extraordinary* means of saving, unaccountable for on the terms of his covenant as apparent to them. It is not necessary to enter into the question, whether those holding these views are consistent in satisfying themselves, and in conceding to others, that God gives his uncovenanted salvation to persons who not only refuse to come within the pale in question, but who make a use of the grace of God, to prove by it that God's covenant is not confined to that pale ; and of whom, (in the case of not a few,) the very first act, consequent on their becoming subjects of the grace of God, has been to desert the fold in question, on the ground that the Spirit of God has guided them to more congenial, perhaps better, pastures. *Assuming* the extraordinary or uncovenanted character of the means of saving grace, thus recognized as Divinely extended to many, and so recognized even by those who *condemn the use of them*, this question is humbly proposed ;—whether the Divine employment of such extraordinary means,—and this so constantly, as to render it apparently the Divine will that souls shall be saved as well without the Church (assumed to be such) as within it—does not witness against something abnormal in the state of the Church. This abnormal state appears in the too cramped character of ecclesiastical institutions, such that they are rendered by human policy too little adapted to be universal ; though such was the designed character of the Church itself. To say that there is actual universality in the adaptedness of its discretionary institutions, is to maintain what is not borne out by the existing state of things. What many persons mean by such alleged adaptation to spiritual wants, is rather, that the spiritual wants of all men ought to take that form, which would best prove the universal adaptedness of the institutions approved by the majority. But if the various forms of spiritual want, such

as they are, or of that spiritual weakness which is a source of experienced want, are not provided for by the Church, she does not fulfil her mission. It is her duty to tend and nurture alike those who feel themselves to be helpless without ritual aid, and those who cannot endure exclusive ritual institutes.¹ What spiritual wants are there that have *not* grown out of infirmity? The weaker the brethren, the more claim they have on her for such an adaptation of her institutions as shall include provision for their case, if practicable. If the Church is an asylum for sick souls, it should not be made to appear, in the case of any who are seeking the Saviour, either that there is no room for them, or that they are not wanted, because the form and lineaments of their spiritual character do not follow suit. The Church was designed to comprise the development of the entire life of Christianity, in the variety of its conformations. . If then her legislation tends to promote the separation, from her pale, of any who are "alive unto God," she cuts off *life*, and is accountable for such excision; she is then, in fact, *sectarian*. Ought she not, rather, to aim at being so comprehensive, that godliness could not easily be found out of her pale?²—It might have been expected that those who hold the most exclusive views on the Church question, (in the usual forms of its presentation) would be the most anxious that the wings of the Church should be extended over those to whom uniformity is impracticable, or who are impracticable to uniformity. The sacrifice of unessentials (strictly such) by the former, must be a small matter in comparison with the vital interests involved in the question of incorporation with the Church. Still, a sense of the inestimable importance of such a question is far from having yet found expression, in a policy responsive to it.

The interposition of what has been termed *extraordinary* or *uncovenanted* grace, by Him, who is "the Head over all things to the Church," has the moral significance and effect of a strong protest against the unreasonable policy of the Church. He thus informs the Church, that *he* will not abide by her limitations; and suggests, visibly enough, that since she claims to be "his body," she should aspire likewise to a state in which she can shew that she is "the fulness of him that filleth all in all."

¹ The latter class of Christians appear to have given the most attention to one department of liturgical rites—the *hymnic*.

² The case of the Society of Friends, from the nature of it, could not be ecclesiastically provided for. But that which is evangelical in its life, would, most probably merge in any truly catholic system.

This she is not, as *humanly modified*, for she virtually ignores a great portion of the life of Christianity; she does not comprise the fulness of Christ's life, as manifested in all who are alive unto God through him.

The question then arises, what appropriate limits might be proposed to the scope of ecclesiastical institutes for *universal* reception in the Christian communion.

It may be questioned whether a more ample confession of faith ought to be required, even as a test to such as aspire to minister in the church of Christ, than such as relates to the Holy Godhead, and to the Person, Character, and History of our Blessed Lord,—in substance, his Incarnation, Atoning Sacrifice, Resurrection and Ascension. These few articles of faith, with a retention of the two holy Sacraments, would surely be, so far as *general* institutes are concerned, adequately conservative of the Christian faith. As to the policy of excluding errors in doctrine, by force of canon, it is worthy of consideration whether the advantages contemplated in this course are not, in the long run, counterbalanced by the collateral tendency to a canonical retention of errors. There can hardly be a better prospect for the prevalence of the truth, than when the word of God has free course; for then, "if the gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost."—If moreover canonical discipline, respecting *worship*, was such as merely to exclude the offering of religious worship, in any sense or degree, to any created being, also the use of images or other personal representations in any form of religious worship or ceremony, there would probably be not as much scope given to abuse of liberty in worship, as there would be to edifying liberty in the same.—Under the head of *moral* tenets, there are perhaps but two forms of *religious immorality* needing to be specifically abjured by the Church: One is, the sale or grant of ecclesiastical indulgences for sin; the other is, the infliction of pains and penalties for religious faith or practice.

The evils of conflicting instruction could hardly prevail in a greater degree than at present, even within the pale of many of the Christian denominations. What more conflicting instruction can be found than in the Protestant Episcopal Church, on the question of the effects of Baptism? The difference between ultra Romanist and Zuinglian views of the *Eucharist* has not a moral importance as vital as that between the opposite views in the church above named, in relation to the question of *Regeneration*, if this importance is measured by the interests directly involved.—Again, as to the supposition that there would be

difficulties in the way of practical co-operation among those who differ widely on a variety of points, it should be remembered that there are various departments of practical co-operation, in some of which those who are not in the same communion join notwithstanding, while in others communion is no guarantee for co-operation. And, even as regards a contemplation of difficulty in the professional intercourse of differing clergy united in communion, two considerations present themselves. One is, that where there are opposed parties within the same denomination, the differing clergy are at no loss with regard to the ordinary exclusion of one another from their pulpits,—and this, inoffensively enough. The other is, that intercourse so based as outwardly to imply a recognition of various points of wide difference, is more easy and discretionary than when based on professed agreement on too many points, or on a reference in common to standards to which each party assigns a different and exclusive interpretation.¹

On the feasibility of a restoration of unity in communion, hear Dr. Nevin, in the concluding passage of his treatise on *Sect and Schism*:—"Faith in the Church is not of itself all that the case requires; but it is the first and greatest thing, that must open the way for all ulterior counsel and action; and it is worse than idle to prate sentimentally of our good purposes in its absence. Half of our sects would be at once dissolved by it, like mists before the rising sun; while the field of division and debate, among the rest, would be narrowed to less than half its present dimensions; and, in the distance at least, would be seen rising to the fond vision of hope, the glorious one Catholic CHURCH OF THE FUTURE as the praise, and joy, and glory of the whole earth."

¹ The platform on which Protestant Episcopalians meet is an awkward one, off which differing parties desire to push one another. Although their standards of faith have been drawn up in a spirit of compromise, two parties respectively insist that their own construction of them is the only justifiable one, and that persons holding the opposite views ought not to be in the Protestant Episcopal Church. Each of these parties has more affinity with some denominations with which it has no communion, than with the opposite party within the same communion. The consequences are, perpetual heartburning, party captiousness, and exposure to occasional harassing from one another, since neither can well enter into the religious sensibilities of the other, and it is a rather curious phenomenon, that while, in nearly every diocese, the party which happens to be in a minority, complains of being excluded by the other from representation in the executive councils of the diocese,—the members of the same party, if ascendant in another diocese, incur the same complaint for similar exclusiveness.

The dissolution of denominational societies may be less desirable, for reasons that will by and by appear.

The learned author above named remarks (p. 69)—“ Since the Reformation, in particular, the Church has fallen unavoidably into the form of more or less rupture with itself; so as to appear divided into different confessional organizations; without still losing, on this account, the internal oneness of its life as a whole.” The necessity for rupture into confessional organizations, *so separate as they have been*, may be less apparent to one who is nevertheless convinced that “ a denomination or confession forms a component part of the universal Church” (p. 69.) There can be no doubt, that several of the denominations are justly entitled to the character claimed for them, as “ representing, for the time, a certain essential side of the common Christianity, which must otherwise have been undervalued and wronged; with the prospect and hope of a final re-integration of the interests, thus divided, into their proper Catholic unity.” (ibid.) But there may be good reason for not conceding, that it is by any “ inward necessity” that they are “ separated from the general body,” (ibid.) The fact seems to be, that the separation of these portions of the universal Church is attributable mainly to the circumstance, that *internal ties*, having a certain range not otherwise than consonant with Christian liberty, have been misused for the limitation of *external relations*. All these denominations could have existed, and flourished even in a greater measure, within a single comprehensive one. They might have cherished their peculiar characteristics, and maintained their denominational confraternities, all within one communion—that is, recognizing some constitutional centre—even as the Dominican and other Roman Catholic orders (or denominations) flourish in accommodating independence of one another, yet united in a common fold. Those who should object to this independent variety in social organization, within the comprehensive Church, would be doing the very work of the sects all along, from ignorance of the constitutional differences among minds; the kingdom of God within the soul of man being developed in a variety of phases, to which these constitutional diversities contribute. Without full scope for the various tendencies in question, there can be no prospect of a permanent coherence between reunited sections of the universal Church.¹

¹ With this view of the use of denominational institutions, it is manifestly impolitic for any denomination to aim at proselytism, with reference

A striking example here suggests itself of the diversity there is in the religious provisions desiderated by different minds, or by similar minds in a different state. Most evangelical Protestants in Italy, not having felt the need of a ritual for their own use, do not recognize any usefulness in rituals, and are rather inclined to reject them, on account of the abuse of them in which they had themselves participated, when in the Roman Obedience. On the other hand, very many Italians, who feel themselves to be in want of a religion, so to speak, adhere in form to the Roman confession and ritual—or rather to that ritual, and *with* it that confession—because they are unable to see and feel a church, except through the medium of a ritual. Consequently, how ill qualified is the one class of Italians alluded to, for judging of the spiritual wants of the other! Such is an illustration of the duty of the Church of Christ to aim at supplying the spiritual want of every cast of mental character, and that not on *conditions*, such as the acceptance of sectional or social shibboleths, that may do for circles or even tribes, but not for humanity at large. But again, an Italian Christian leaving the Church of Rome, and knowing little if anything of any other ecclesiastical organization than that which he abandons, sees suddenly before him a number of Protestant societies, recognizing no constitutional tie in common, and having little to do with one another. Having supposed that his reception of the gospel of Christ, in its purity, was to put an end to his ritual and confessional distractions, such a one can scarcely be blamed, if, sitting at the feet of his Lord, he is content with a state of ecclesiastical isolation,—or rather *individualism*, for no man is *isolated* who communes with his Redeemer,—and there declines to be “careful and troubled about” matters of ecclesiastical

to its own pale. And it is probably *some* sense of this, which is unconsciously at the bottom of such canonical provisions as, when rigorously put in force by some denominations, serve undesignedly to check uncongenial accessions to their communion. I allude to the close (or exclusive) communion of some, who nevertheless aspire to the enrolment of numbers among their professing adherents.

Here also the question presents itself, as to how the benefits of a close communion could be conserved under such a system as would place all the faithful in one open communion. If there should be a disposition to reconcile the two, there need be no apprehension of a failure in effecting appropriate arrangements for example, those societies of which the members, as such, should desire to commune together exclusively, on certain occasions, might assign, to as many of their places of worship as they pleased, the character of *private chapels*, as discriminated from their *churches*, in which the communion should be open.

economy. If however but one pure Church is shewn him, then the variety of independent societies within it, instead of distracting him, would provide for the greater freedom of his mind, through the scope they would afford to his Christian liberty.

If a disposition were prevalent, towards such a re-union as Dr. Nevin well terms "a final re-integration of the interests thus divided, into their proper catholic unity," there would be no difficulty as to the adoption of the external bond necessary for their cohesion. This bond must necessarily be a *constitutional element*, whatever might be the character of the corporations intended to be associated. And in the case of the Christian economy, what can that element be but the ministry? All the Christian bodies have indeed their ministry. What then is needed to identify, so far as communion can do it, the ministry of one denomination with those of the others? Simply an ecclesiastical channel in common for ministerial commission and recognition. As we are speaking of an external bond, and not of that spirit by which all true Christians are one in Christ, by reason of their collective union with the Head, it would be irrelevant for any one to offer the objecting plea that ministerial commission is derived only from *Christ*. This is taken for granted, and we may feel encouraged by this very consideration to hope for something more than one might otherwise do,—namely that ministers, having *such* a commission, will be the more prompt, from that circumstance, to make concessions (not otherwise than innocent) for the purpose of giving a universal character, a universally recognized and welcome capacity, to every denominational ministry, and of thus extending indefinitely the scope of their efficiency. If the clergy of entire denominations were to consent to a repetition of the professional ceremony for setting them apart for the ministry, they might call this ceremony what they would respectively,—whether *re-ordination* to the ministry, or *institution* to an enlarged field of ministration, or the *inauguration* of a re-union among the churches; and they might mean what they would by the designation. If this however should be attended, as in the case of not a few it probably would, with some compromise of their feelings, (sectarian pride?) yet how small a matter does this appear, in comparison with the grounds for exultation, at the great ends promising to be answered by such a movement! Of what account would be the contradicted feelings of whole congregations, (such as feelings of *this* kind ordinarily are,) against the golden auspices that would be reflected over the horizon of their prospects!

In solving the question of an ecclesiastical authority, of uni-

versal *capacity*, whatever might be the contemplated limitations and conditions of the practical relation of such to the universal Church, minds free from a sectarian spirit could not but desire to find a historical and world-wide principle ready at hand, as being the best adapted for selection. If such a policy should inspire the solution of the question, (and the question is here treated as one of policy,) to what conclusion is it likely to lead them, if not to the adoption of *Episcopacy*, so far as the end in question is to be answered? That this is the most prevalent system throughout Christendom, is a consideration of especial importance, with reference to those countries where corrupt forms of Christianity prevail, and that for obvious reasons; while, for reasons somewhat less obvious, the above mentioned circumstance merits great attention, with reference to regions where semi-infidelity severs the past from itself. These considerations do not, certainly, furnish complete proof of the world-wide adaptedness of *Episcopacy*. But all that is wanted to complete such proof, is the fact that, in most of the important denominations, that system is practically in use.¹ Such a retention of it by them, (under whatever denominational modifications,) as it were in spite of themselves, seems to indicate a radical moral necessity for it, of a kind and degree hardly susceptible of explanation. Such an impression of its essential conservatism does not, in itself, involve, as even necessary to consistency, a recognition of the ministerial succession from the apostles, as claimed for episcopally ordained clergymen. Yet one may feel surprised at a position sometimes taken by the opponents of *Episcopacy*, in effect, that the asserted succession is so extraordinary a claim, as to require not only extraordinary proof, but such proof as cannot be evaded: while, on the other hand, those who estimate, as of a remarkable kind, the evidences of that succession, regard it as the manifestation of a special Providence, in support of what appears to them to have been a promise. Yet, since its continuity has been so provided for by ecclesiastical practice,—three bishops having been almost universally in requisition to take part in a consecration,—it would seem to be a matter rather to have been wondered at, if the succession had failed, and that in every line. Its continuity would appear to be so obvious a result, that it might well weaken one's belief in any special in-

¹ This remark has reference to the prevalent division of ministerial offices among three classes (virtually three orders) and to the peculiar functions of presiding officers.

terposition of Providence to effect this phenomenon in history. —However, such as the succession is, and whatever it may be worth, it seems morally impracticable for Christians to be united in one communion, unless the ministers of the different denominations will place themselves in a common relation, by accepting such canonical orders as comprise all others,—consequently the orders of those who claim the succession alluded to. The superadded succession would be no burthen to such as do not claim it; while to others, deprivation of it would be excision—*sectarian excision*.—The more ample the communion comprising the united churches, the greater would be the number of bishops required for each diocese. The distribution of them would be required to have reference to societies as well as to localities. And should there be any difficulties in the way of an unconfused and unembarrassed fulfilment of their mission, such would be *prima facie* indications that they, or their people, or both, were still sectarian or schismatic, whatever they might be besides. A house or board of metropolitans, (so to call them,) with the aid of the best jurists, might be a court of appeal from every section of the Church,—the members being impartially selected. Nor should such a court fail to include some of the ablest Christian jurists.

Such a comprehensive Church would not need to lose time in a parley about her proper *name*. What other name should it be than “The Church of Christ?” She could well afford to concede such designations as “Catholic,” and “Protestant,” to whatever parties might want them. How great would be the capacity of such a consolidated body,—the more powerful by reason of the *distinct organization within it*,—for moral influence on the world! And how compact would it be for resistance to assault! Even the intolerance of certain governments would be materially checked by the public spirit that would be thus diffused.

Again, the intellectual life of the church would be greatly promoted by mingling, more than at present, the variously characteristic literature, theological and religious, emanating from the variously developed life within the church.¹ There would be

¹ There is, it is true, considerable interchange and mingling of the literature of different denominations. But the process is strongly marked with sectarian dishonesty. Imagine, for example, the Tract Society suppressing, in their edition of *The Dairyman's Daughter*, a few words in commendation of the Anglican funeral-service, as if apprehensive lest readers unacquainted with it might be introduced to it. Had such eulogy referred to an

more inquiry, impartial, interesting, edifying, into the radical character of denominational features,—not such inquiry as is now too common, merely with a view to expose them,—“the head and front of their offending” being, not unfrequently, that the history of their inward life transcends anything that the personal inward history of the observer himself has in common with it.—But if it is found to be eminently instructive to examine the deep principles of the characteristic life of a religious society,—for example, to evolve or to trace those idiosyncrasies, the synthesis of which constitutes Methodism,—edification of a more comprehensive kind, and on a grander scale, attends analogous philosophical inquiry into the moral wants of humanity at large, as expressing a necessity for divine institutes of universal applicability. The adaptation of such institutes to meet those wants, can be set forth in all the forms that moral or intellectual science suggest, without a disproportionate reliance on the scope of reason. The true doctrine of “God manifest in the flesh” commands the highest appreciation, when it is subserved by exhibitions of the antecedent demand in Nature for such manifestation, also of its rational probability, and of its all-sufficiency to humanity, both for the recovery of the latter from any depth of moral degradation, and for the satisfaction of any conceivable human aspiration, natural or inspired, towards moral elevation. Even this extent of appreciation, which is within the capacity of reason, necessitates, as a consequence, a recognition of the appointed resource for all aspiration that is founded on this central truth and basis of hope,—that resource being the Holy Spirit, inseparable from the glorified person of Christ. It is to the failure of a due collateral dependence on *him*, as the Giver of life,—the life *of* and *in* the glorified God-man, whose messenger and everliving channel of grace to us he is,—that those unhealthful developments are owing, which, while claiming to exalt the doctrine of the Incarnation, rather defeat the spiritual end and use of it, by inculcating undue dependence on subordinate means of participation in Christ. A sensibility to the operation of that Spirit, as our living tie with the Person of the Redeemer, is the best guarantee for a right estimate of visible institutions. And the doctrine of *the Church* then keeps

“eloquent prayer addressed to an audience,” who knows whether the spirit of *revision for publication* would have been as sensitive? To away with sectarianism is the only way to relieve the eye from the daily proofs—which are not all, by any means, of the same nature as the above—of moral obliquity in sectarian policy.

its place, less as a dogma for which people must have their definitions, than as held "of a true heart in love;"¹ in which case, there is all the salutary benefit from it, without the danger of Christ being obscured by the Church, as when the Sun,

—— "from behind the Moon,
In dim eclipse, disastrous twilight sheds."²

This slight extension of remark on the probable result of a nearer relation between the castes of church literature, may appear at least relevant, in association with the tending guardianship of particular truths, or particular *phases* of truth, by different Christian bodies. It is through such conflict or amalgamation as is liable to result from this relation, that faith in divine truths becomes more intelligent and experienced, and the truths themselves better armed to make their way. To convert definitions of truth into exclusive canons, in order to set controversy at rest, is perhaps one way of causing Christians to *sleep* over those truths,—the duty of *watching* over them being in a manner dispensed with.

On the whole, the general principles of a proper union among Christians appear to be these,—to return to the starting-point of Christianity for indispensable general institutes;—to leave minor or less, indispensable institutes, together with the solution of questions depending on an estimate of historical development, to the sphere of the denominations *as we find them*;—also, to have a channel in common for ministerial commission, without impairing existing organizations—a spirit of conservatism rather than of change, presiding in these contemplations. Such a mode of *convergence* appears to be the best guarantee for the liberty of *divergence*, and the best security against union without unity, and unity without interest (or indifferent unity). If there is a practicable mode, whether it be this or any other, of effecting ecclesiastical unity, consistently with the maintenance of every form of Christian liberty, then the prolonged adjournment of it would too fully bear out the representation by an English non-conformist, that this is "an age which groans over the want of Union in the church, and yet, in too many instances, hugs that mental littleness which renders union impossi-

¹ Thus is rendered the expression *αληθεύοντες εν αγαπη*, (Ephes. iv : 15,) by Professor Lewis. See his remarks on the "subjective sense of the word *αληθεύω*,"—note 3 to *Plato contra Atheos*.

² Milton.

ble.”¹ The sectarian, morally such, is he who will not aid the furtherance of Christian unity. He who yearns for this consummation, but cannot see his desire realized, must have patience with that sectarian position, from which he cannot free himself by any change in his ecclesiastical relations.

There is abroad a spreading weariness of disunion, and desire of unity, which would no doubt be much greater, if it were not generally imagined (though unnecessarily) that denominational predilections and associations must be sacrificed to its accomplishment. This sense of the *ecclesiastical* want of the age, checked as it is by sectarian tenaciousness, is rather coincident with a *political* spirit now diffused through several countries,² in favor of federal unity, which is however impeded by an undue proportion of sectional jealousy. A period of the most perilous trial threatens to arrive; when these coincident wants may together have reached an impatient climax. For the man of the age may then appear, possessing genius and infernal inspiration, adequate to sustain a fair promise to “gather together in one all things.” Should therefore a character appear, arrogating the associate offices of Prophet, Priest, and King;—or should merely a union of the imperial sceptre of the West with the keys of a Pontifex Maximus, in the same individual, become a world-question,—such a character may well, “if possible, deceive the very elect,” ere the latter detect a *personal Antichrist*. Thus, the continued unsettlement of the church question will be in itself a probable source of temptation, at such an epoch. But, to escape the snares of any false Messiah, the indispensable securities for the individual Christian are an acquaintance with the *person* and *character* of the true one, also with his *voice*,—which latter is, and will be, no other than that of the Paraclete, until our Blessed Lord shall personally re-appear. Without a recognition of the voice of the Holy Spirit speaking to our heart of hearts, how can we really know the person, from whom that spirit proceedeth as his Agent until his re-appearing?—But, though it is only through the possession in common of that Spirit that we can all be one, as the Father and the Incarnate Son are one, that we may be *one in them*, still Unity in the external relation of the professed followers of Christ tends materially—though of course in a less degree than when they are quickened into the Unity of the Spirit, in the above sense,—to the moral effect of converting the world.

¹ Farrer's Schleiermacher—Let. Dedic. to Pye Smith.

² Germany and Italy, in particular.

CYPRIAN.

Second Article.

It has been already mentioned, that those who renounced their faith, under the sore pressure of the Decian persecution, were not willing for the most part to continue in this dreadful renunciation. Their sin of itself excluded them from the privileges and hopes of the Church. They professed repentance however, and sought to be restored to its communion. In many cases, this was without any proper evidence of such inward humiliation, and true change of mind, as the solemnity of the offence required. The very number of the delinquents stood in the way of a just regard to discipline. It was easy to make light account of an offence, into which it had been found so easy to fall, and in which so many were concerned. The system of discipline too was not definitely settled at all points, in regard to the treatment of those who were brought into such condemnation. The cases of transgression also were by no means all of one and the same moral enormity. There was room for distinctions, and so for pleas of special indulgence and favor. Most of all however, reliance was placed on the intercession of the confessors and martyrs. It had long been a standing belief in the Church, that such faithful witnesses for Christ, besides winning an extraordinary crown for themselves, had power by their prayers and merits to recommend in a peculiar way the cause of others also who applied to them for such help. Many felt that a recommendation from this quarter, was equivalent to a full right and title to the privilege it enforced. The lapsed in particular, who had forfeited all merit of their own, considered it a powerful advantage to come in for a sort of partnership interest, in this way, in the merit of those who by their sufferings might be said to have made good in some sense to the Church, the failure and fall of her less constant children. Recourse was had to them accordingly in prison, for letters of peace, as they were called, or written testimonials, recommending such as received them to pardon and reconciliation with the Church. Such intercession was supposed to be specially of force, when obtained from one who was on the point of sealing his testimony with blood; the crown of actual martyrdom gave additional weight to the patronage, which was thus transferred from earth to heaven. Something of the same authority however was felt to belong to all the confessors. By showing themselves willing and ready to die for Christ, if necessary, they were all regarded

as standing high in the Divine favor, and as having special and extraordinary claims to respect among men. To the exercise of such patronage as we have now in consideration, so long as it was kept within proper bounds, there could be no reasonable objection. There was a true deep and solid ground for it in the mysterious constitution of Christianity itself. But in the nature of the case, it was very liable to run into the form of an abuse. The confessors were by no means all wise and discreet. Many of them in fact were very ignorant. Their very zeal for the salvation of souls might betray them into a false compassion. To some of them too, there could hardly fail to be a snare in the function of authority itself, which they were called to exercise in this high spiritual form. It carried in it a dangerous aliment for pride in one direction, as well as for something like religious fanaticism in another. Certificates and recommendations were liable to be given in this way with too much facility and freedom, and to be so used afterwards as to interfere seriously with the proper ends of church discipline. Such was the abuse that actually followed on no inconsiderable scale. Through the weakness or levity of some of the confessors, these indulgences, or letters of peace, were given to applicants of every character and class, in the greatest profusion and without any sort of discrimination or judgment. In some cases, they were put into so loose a form as to be tickets of admission into the church, not simply for the holder, but for his family also or friends, as many as he might choose to embrace under the convenient privilege, "*Communicet ille cum suis.*" Armed with such powerful recommendation, a great crowd of temporary apostates, now anxious professedly to repair their past fault, knocked loudly at the door of the church, demanding rather than begging to be restored to its privileges. To make the matter still worse, a portion of the clergy showed a disposition to yield to the pressure, and allowed themselves to communicate with the lapsed, on terms which overthrew in truth all order and discipline. This served of course to encourage their violent impatience, and made it more difficult than it would have been otherwise to deal with the case in the right way.

The occasion was serious and trying. The cause of the lapsed might be said to be a popular one, in view of the numbers who were concerned in it, and in view also of the great credit of the confessors and martyrs who seemed to be enlisted to a certain extent on its side. It required no little courage to face it with direct opposition. This however Cyprian did not hesitate to do, with all the authority which he felt to belong to him

in the character of a bishop. He saw the whole discipline of the church at stake, in the course things were threatening to take. But it was no hierarchical feeling merely, no zeal simply for the honor of his own order, that engaged him to take his stand. He saw in this relaxation of discipline, an extreme danger at the same time for the souls of those, in whose favor the deceitful privilege was sought. However desirable it was for those who had fallen to be restored to the peace of the church, this could be done effectually only through real humiliation and penance on their own part, making room for ecclesiastical absolution afterwards in a regular and valid form. Such was the necessary wholesome medicine, which God had provided for the healing of sin. There must be on the one side an *exomologesis* or confession, going to the bottom of the offence and carrying along with it the force of a real penitential expiation or satisfaction in some form; and then on the other side, to complete this, a solemn formal release under the hand of the ministering priest, bringing relief to the conscience from God himself. Unit- ing in it itself both these conditions, reconciliation with the church might be regarded as something more than an empty outward ceremony; it carried in it the force of a really Divine transaction, which served actually to reconcile the subject at the same time with Christ and with God, and gave him a title sacramentally to all the blessings of heaven. But the abuse before us tended towards the destruction of this salutary order on both sides. It turned the *exomologesis* into a superficial sham on one side; while on the other it obscured the proper sense of the grace of absolution, as a power proceeding through the priesthood only from the general church. It was under this view especially, that Cyprian set himself with all his might in opposition to the irregularity; sending letter upon letter from the place of his retreat, now to the clergy, now to the people, and now to the confessors themselves, full of instruction and warning with regard to the whole case. His tract, *De Lapsis*, is taken up mainly with the same subject. With great earnestness and firmness, he insists that the lapsed should not be at once restored to the peace of the church. They were not indeed to be rejected without mercy, as persons for whom there was no hope. On the contrary, they must be received as penitents, and encouraged in this character to desire and seek, as also to expect in the end, a release from church censure; but in the nature of the case, this course of penitential trial, where the offence had been so great, ought to be of long duration, and in a form to show true inward grief and humiliation. The terms of restora-

tion must be governed in some measure by the character of the offence in different cases ; but to fix and determine them was no business for private judgment merely or hasty particular decision. Let the persecution first come fairly to an end. Then the bishops might come together in council, and after suitable deliberation adopt such rules and decrees, as would secure uniform practice and meet all the exigencies of the case. In the mean time, the confessors must exercise their prerogative with becoming humility, and not in such a way as to do violence to the Divine order of the church ; lest the merit of their good confession should be again neutralized and made of no account, by what must be regarded as an act of treason to the very cause in whose behalf it had taken place.

Addressing the general body of the people, Cyprian writes on the subject as follows :¹

“ That you mourn and grieve over the ruin of our brethren, I know from myself, most dearly beloved, who also groan with you on their account, and am in great sorrow and pain, and feel what the beloved apostle has said, (2 Cor. xi : 29): ‘ Who is weak, and I am not weak ? Who is offended, and I burn not ? ’ Or as he has it in another place, (1 Cor. xii : 26): ‘ Whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it ; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it. ’ So I suffer and grieve for our brethren, who fallen and prostrated by the stress of persecution have carried away with them a part of our bowels, inflicting on us thus the sharp pain of their own wounds ; which nevertheless the Divine mercy is able to cure. The case however, in my judgment, calls for deliberation and caution, lest by a too forward usurpation of peace more heavy occasion only be given for the Divine displeasure. The blessed martyrs have written to us with regard to certain persons, commending their desires to our consideration. When the Lord shall first have given us all peace restoring us to the church, the cases will be examined severally along with your presence and judgment. I hear however that some of the presbyters, unmindful of the gospel, and not heeding what the martyrs have written to us, nor reserving to the bishop the honor of his priesthood and see, have already begun to communicate with the lapsed, and to offer for them and give them the eucharist—things that should be reached only in due course and order. For whereas in smaller offences which are not committed directly against God, penance is per-

¹ Ep. 17, ed. Tauchn.

formed for a suitable time, and confession is made with proper probation of life in the case of the penitent, and no one can come to communication unless through the imposition of hands upon him first by the bishop and clergy ; how much more is it needful, in the case of these most heavy and extreme offences, that all things should be conducted cautiously and wisely according to the discipline of the Lord ! This indeed our presbyters and deacons ought to have urged, for the welfare of the sheep committed to their care, and to guide them by the divine rule into the way of suing for salvation. I know both the tractableness and the reverence of our people, who would have given themselves diligently to the work of satisfaction and deprecation towards God, had not some of the presbyters to please them led them astray. Be it your part then to exercise over the minds of the lapsed severally a wise and wholesome influence, in conformity with the divine precepts. Let no one unseasonably pluck fruit which is still unripe ; let no one commit to the deep again his vessel battered and pierced by the waves, before it has been diligently repaired ; let no one hasten to receive and put on a rent garment, if he see it not mended by a skilful workman and made fit to wear by the art of the fuller. Let them listen patiently, I pray, to our counsel ; let them wait for our return ; that when we shall have come to you through the mercy of God, we may be able in a council of our fellow bishops to examine the letters and requests of the blessed martyrs, according to the discipline of the Lord, in the presence of the confessors and with the assistance also of your judgment. In regard to this, I have written letters both to the clergy and to the martyrs and confessors, which I have directed to be read also in your hearing. My desire is, brethren dearly beloved and longed for, that ye may always prosper in the Lord and bear us in mind. Farewell."

In his letter to the clergy, (Ep. 16, ed. Tauchn.), he refers still more sharply to the conduct of those presbyters, who had encouraged the disorder of which he complains. They had been treating his authority with contempt before. He had held his peace for a time ; but the case now had become too serious for silence ; not only the honor of the episcopate was invaded ; that might be overlooked ; but the safety of souls also was in question. The case of the lapsed was in danger of being made worse, instead of better, by a hollow and groundless restoration of peace. Their offence had been of the heaviest kind, and called for corresponding remedy and help. "He who conceals this from our brethren, deceives them deplorably ; so that those

who might do true penance and satisfy the paternal and merciful God by their prayers and works, are seduced into greater perdition, and those who might rise experience a still deeper fall. For while in the case of smaller sins the offenders do penance for proper time, and in the order of discipline come to confession, and by the imposition of the hands of the bishop and clergy receive the right of communicating; now in an unripe time, the persecution still continuing and the church itself not yet restored to peace, these are admitted to communion, and their name is offered; and no penance yet done, no confession yet made, no hand yet laid upon them by the bishop and clergy, they are allowed to receive the eucharist; of which it is written: 'Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord' (1 Cor. xi: 27)." The fault of all this lay with those, whose business it was to instruct the people, and to keep them to a proper observance of the divine precepts. The blessed martyrs too were wronged by what was done. *They* had, with becoming regard for the rights of the bishop, referred the case to him for favorable judgment, after peace should have been restored to the suffering church; these unruly priests, on the contrary, "refusing us the honor allowed by the martyrs along with the confessors, and disregarding the law and rule of the Lord the observance of which is enjoined by these same martyrs and confessors, before the fear of persecution is over, before our return, almost before the decease itself of the martyrs, communicate with the lapsed, and offer and give the eucharist; whereas if even the martyrs, overlooking scripture in the heat of their zeal, had desired anything going against the law of the Lord, they ought to have been set right by the admonition of the presbyters and deacons, according to usage in time past."

Writing to the martyrs and confessors, (Ep. 15), he takes occasion to say: "Official concern and the fear of the Lord compels us to admonish you by letter, most brave and blessed brethren, that ye who have so devotedly and courageously kept the faith of the Lord, may show like care for the observance also of the Lord's discipline and law. For whilst all the soldiers of Christ should be true to the orders of their leader, it is most of all fit that they should be obeyed by you, who have become an example to others of virtue and piety. And I had supposed indeed, that the presbyters and deacons, who are on the ground, would admonish and instruct you fully with regard to the law of the gospel; as it was always the custom, under our predecessors, for the deacons to assist and guide the wishes

of the martyrs in prison by counsel and scriptural rule. But now with the greatest grief I learn, not only that there has been no such suggestion to you of the divine precepts, but that even what ye yourselves proposed in the way of caution towards God and honor towards his priest, is made of no effect by some of the presbyters, who forget what is due both to God and the bishop. For whereas you had written to me, desiring your prayer to be examined, and peace to be restored to certain lapsed persons, when we should be able to meet with the clergy at the close of the persecution, these unfaithful ministers—against the rule of the gospel, against your respectful petition also, before the doing of penance, before confession made of the most serious and extreme offence, before the imposition of hands by the bishop and clergy for repentance—dare to offer for them, and to give them the eucharist, that is, to profane the sacred body of the Lord; since it is written: ‘Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.’ And in this there may be some excuse indeed for the lapsed. For who that is dead may not in haste to be made alive? Who may not be eager to run to his own salvation? But it is the business of the rulers to keep the law, and to instruct the hasty or ignorant, lest they become butchers, who should be shepherds, of the sheep. For when they concede what tends to destruction they do but deceive; and the fallen are not raised thus, but by offending God are urged into greater ruin. Let them then learn from you, what they ought rather themselves to have taught; let them reserve your petitions and wishes for the bishop, and wait a mature and quiet time for giving the peace for which you intercede. First let the mother have peace from the Lord; then may your petitions be considered for the peace of the children.” They must not suffer themselves, he goes on to say, to be overcome by the importunity of those who sought their aid. The case called for the greatest care and circumspection. As the friends of the Lord, hereafter along with him to judge the world, they should look diligently into the circumstances and merits of each single case; that no occasion for reproach might be given to the surrounding heathen world.

In the tract *De Lapsis*, we have the case put into the same form still more at large. “The priest of God must not deceive with false concessions, but provide for salutary remedies. He is a poor physician, who handles the tumid recesses of wounds with sparing hand, and by saving exaggerates the virus which is seated in the interior depths of the body. The wound must

be opened and cut, the amputation of diseased parts must make room for a more vigorous cure. However the patient may complain and cry out for pain, he will give thanks afterwards, when he comes to the sense of health." The neglect of such salutary discipline forms, in the eyes of Cyprian, a new calamity full as deplorable as the apostacy which had gone before. "A new form of desolation, dearly beloved brethren, has broken forth; and as if the storm of persecution had been a light thing, treacherous mischief and flattering ruin are carried to their height under the name of mercy. Against the vigor of the gospel, against the law of the Lord and of God, communication is thrown open by the temerity of certain persons to the unprepared—an empty and false peace, dangerous to those who give it, and of no worth to such as receive it. They require not patience in order to health, nor true medicine by satisfaction; penitence is driven from the breast, the recollection of the most grave and extreme offence is put out of the way. The wounds of the dying are covered, the deadly plague seated in the inmost vitals is hid under a feigned sorrow. Those who return from the altars of the Devil approach the holy place of the Lord with tainted and unclean hands; still reeking as it were from the deadly food of idols, their throats yet exhaling their own crime and breathing the smell of dire contagion, they invade the Lord's body, in the face of the scripture which exclaims: 'The soul that eateth of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, that pertain unto the Lord, having his uncleanness upon him, even that soul shall be cut off from his people,' (Lev. vii: 20). So the Apostle testifies: 'Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils' (1 Cor. x: 21); as he threatens also the disobedient with this denunciation: 'Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord' (1 Cor. xi: 27). In contempt of all this, before expiation of offence, before confession made of crime, before the purgation of conscience by sacrifice and the hand of the priest, before any pacification of the displeasure of an angry threatening Saviour, violence is done to his body and blood, and they sin now more against the Lord with hands and mouth, than when they denied him before. They take that for peace, which some trade off to them with fallacious words. It is however not peace, but war; no one can be joined to the church, who is separated from the gospel. What? Do they call injury a benefit? Do they set forth impiety under the name of piety? Are those who should be

weeping and calling upon their Lord continuously, to be stopped in their penitential lamentations by the pretence of communication? To such lapsed persons this is what hail is to fruit, a whirlwind to trees, a destroying murrain to cattle, a cruel tempest to ships." All such agencies work, not to cure and save, but only to kill and destroy. It is another persecution in truth, by which the subtle adversary seeks to cut off the last hope for the lapsed, by silencing their grief, causing them to forget their sin, and so preventing them from the use of a long and thorough course of tears and prayers, the only penance that could bring them to a true peace with their offended Lord. "Let no one deceive himself or fall into mistake. The Lord alone can exercise mercy; he only can pardon sins committed against himself, who has carried our sins, who has suffered for us, whom God has given for our iniquities. Man cannot be greater than God; neither can the servant by his indulgence remit or pardon, what has been committed in the way of heavy offence against the Lord; such thought rather must add to the crime of the offender, by his forgetting the word: 'Cursed be the man that trusteth in man.' The Lord is to be entreated, the Lord is to be appeased by our satisfaction, who has said that he will deny those that deny him to whom alone all judgment has been committed by the Father. We believe indeed, that the merits of the martyrs and works of the righteous are of much avail with the Judge; but when the day of judgment shall have come, when after the close of the present life and world the people of Christ shall stand before his tribunal."

The firm position taken by the bishop served to control to a certain extent the disorder here brought into view, and might have corrected it entirely perhaps, if it had not been for the advantage taken of it by the small party which had been secretly opposed to him, as we have before seen, from the time of his election to the episcopate. At the head of the faction stood now the deacon Felicissimus. The time seemed favorable for an insurrectionary movement; and occasion was taken accordingly from a particular church visitation, which Cyprian had ordered by commission previously to his own return, to raise the standard of open revolt. Felicissimus, with Novatian and four other presbyters, refused to acknowledge the authority which it was attempted to exercise in this form, and undertook to establish in fact a separate and independent church; into which the lapsed were encouraged to enter without farther difficulty or delay. Many of them, impatient of the discipline to which they were required to submit in the regular church, fell but too easily into

the snare. Some of the confessors also, who had become involved as patrons in the cause of these bad clients, were led away unhappily by the same spirit of defection. Altogether the movement amounted in a short time to quite a serious schism. Cyprian brings the whole case before us, in a letter addressed to the people of his charge, (Ep. 43), as follows :

“ Although, beloved brethren, the most faithful and exemplary presbyter Virtius, the presbyters Rogatianus and Numidicus, confessors made illustrious by divine distinction, as also the deacons, good men and devoted in all obedience to ecclesiastical order, with the other ministers, give you the full attention of their presence, and cease not to confirm you severally by assiduous exhortations, as well as to direct and reform the minds of the lapsed with salutary counsels—so far as I can nevertheless I also admonish you, and in such way as I can visit you, by letter. By letter I say, dearly beloved brethren. For it is made inexpedient for me to return to you personally before Easter, through the malignity and treachery of certain presbyters; who mindful of their former conspiracy, and retaining their old grudge against my episcopate, that is against your vote and God’s judgment, renew of late their ancient opposition, profanely plotting against our authority in their usual insidious style. And herein truly the providence of God appears, that without will or wish on our part, nay in the midst of our indulgence and silence, they have paid the penalty they deserved, by expelling themselves without expulsion from us, giving sentence against themselves in their own conscience, excommunicating themselves from the church, as wicked conspirators against your will and that of God, by their own voluntary act. Now the faction of Felicissimus is disclosed, whence it came, and wherein it has had its root and strength. These before encouraged and urged some of the confessors, not to abide in concord with their bishop and observe the ecclesiastical discipline with faith and quietness according to the precepts of the Lord, not to maintain the glory of their confession by a corresponding blameless walk and conversation. And as though it had been a small thing, to have corrupted the minds of some confessors, and to have aimed at arming a portion of the ruptured brotherhood against the priesthood of God, they have now turned themselves with venomous deception to the destruction of the lapsed, seeking to turn them away, sick and wounded as they are and by the calamity of their fall disabled for vigorous counsels, from the cure of their wound, and by the interruption of their prayers and deprecations, by which God should be appeased with long continuous

satisfaction, seducing them into deadly presumption by the show of a false and deceitful peace.

“But I beseech you, brethren, be on your guard against the snares of the Devil, and diligently watch for your own salvation against the mortal delusion. This is another persecution, another trial. These five presbyters are nothing different from those five officers, whom the late edict joined with the magistracy, that they might subvert our faith, that they might entangle in deadly snares the weak hearts of brethren by leading them to deny the truth. The case is now the same, the same subversion is again at work to the ruin of souls through the five presbyters joined with Felicissimus; in this namely, that God is not entreated, that he who has denied Christ is not led to deprecate the anger of Christ thus denied, that after the guilt of crime penance also is done away, that there is no satisfaction to the Lord through the bishops and priests, but that with the desertion of the Lord’s priests, against the evangelical rule, a new tradition of sacrilegious institution is set up and made of force. And whereas it had been before agreed upon both by us and by the clergy, and confessors of the metropolis [Rome], as well as by the bishops generally whether in our province or beyond the sea, that no new regulation should be made in regard to the cause of the lapsed, until we should all come together, and with joint consultation settle upon a course in which both discipline and mercy should be properly regarded, this our judgment is rebelled against, and a factious conspiracy formed to overthrow all sacerdotal authority and power. What distress do I not suffer now, beloved brethren, that I cannot come to you in person, to address you severally myself, and to exhort you after the rule of our Lord and his gospel! It was not enough—the exile now of a second year and mournful separation from your face and sight, the incessant grief that gives me away from you no rest in my sore lamentations, the tears that flow day and night because the priest, whom ye created with so much love and zeal, is not yet allowed to salute you and meet your affectionate embrace. To our languishing mind is added now this farther distress, that in so great anxiety and need I cannot myself run to your aid, lest through the passion and craft of the traitors our presence should give rise to new tumult, and that the bishop, who ought to consult in all things for peace and tranquillity may not appear to have himself given occasion for sedition, and to have provoked fresh persecution. From where I am however, beloved brethren, I counsel and warn you, trust not rashly pernicious words, assent not lightly to declarations which are

false, take not darkness for light, night for day, famine for food, thirst for drink, poison for medicine, death for salvation. Let neither their age nor authority deceive you, who resembling in wickedness the two elders, that of old sought to corrupt and violate the chaste Susannah, endeavour by spurious doctrines to corrupt the purity of the church and violate evangelical truth.

“The Lord cries aloud and says: ‘Hearken not unto the words of the false prophets, who speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord; who say to them that reject the word of the Lord, Ye shall have peace’ (Jer. xxiii: 16, 17). Those now offer peace, who themselves have no peace; those pretend to bring back the lapsed into the church, who have themselves withdrawn from the church. God is one, and Christ is one, and there is one church, and one cathedra founded on the rock by the Lord’s voice. No other altar can be set up, there can be no new priesthood, by reason of the one altar and one priesthood. He who gathers elsewhere, scatters. Adulterous, impious, sacrilegious is whatever human passion may institute, in violation of a Divine arrangement. Keep far away from the contagion of such men, and avoid their word as you would flee from a cancer or plague, mindful of the Lord’s warning; ‘They be blind leaders of the blind; and if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.’ They intercept your prayers, which with us you pour forth to God day and night, that you may appease him with just satisfaction; they intercept your tears, by which you wash away the guilt of the offence which has been committed; they intercept the peace, which ye seek truly and faithfully from the mercy of the Lord, not knowing that it is written: ‘That prophet, or that dreamer of dreams, which hath spoken to turn you away from the Lord your God, shall be put to death’ (Deut. xiii: 5). Let no one, dear brethren, turn you aside from the ways of the Lord, let no one force you Christians from the gospel of Christ, let no one sunder the children of the church from the church. Let those perish alone, who have willed to perish; let those remain alone on the outside of the church, who have withdrawn from the church; let those alone be separate from the bishops, who have rebelled against the bishops; let those alone suffer the penalty of their conspiracy, who by your vote formerly and God’s judgment now have deserved such condemnation.”

Here we are introduced to Cyprian’s doctrine of the Church, which may be said to underlie and condition his whole theological system. Opportunity was soon given for bringing it into view, with yet clearer as well as more ample representation, and in terms of still more commanding decision and force.

His return to Carthage took place soon after Easter a. 251, after an absence of about fourteen months. The persecution had run its course; and the way was now open for the re-appearance of the bishop, in the full exercise of his episcopal functions, without danger of new commotion. The first great concern was to settle, in provincial council, the course to be pursued throughout the Church in regard to the lapsed. Such a system was adopted, as the necessities of the whole case, in the united judgment of the assembled bishops, appeared to require and demand. Those who had so grievously sinned, were not to be lightly set free from the bonds of their guilt. They must submit to a long and severe course of humiliation and sorrow, making satisfaction to God, and proving the sincerity of their repentance, by patient continuance in prayers and tears. With this however was held out, for their encouragement, the hope and prospect of reconciliation with the church at some future time; that they might not be thrown into despair, and so be led to fall back as hopeless outcasts from the church into the life of the heathen world. Regard was to be had, at the same time, to the nature and circumstances of each particular case of offence, some being entitled in this view of course to much greater indulgence than others. It was still farther provided, that where there was danger of death, in the case of a penitent who seemed to be sincere, an earlier reconciliation should take place, so that none thus earnestly seeking the peace of the church might be doomed to the great calamity of leaving the world without it. Some time after, as we shall see, a general relaxation or indulgence was allowed on this principle, in view of a new persecution under the Emperor Gallus; for which, it was held, the penitents could not be properly prepared, without the aids of grace that were to be found only in the bosom of the church.

In the same council, judgment was solemnly given against the schism of Felicissimus, with sentence of excommunication upon all who had joined themselves to his party and cause. Some attempts were still made afterwards to carry forward the rebellious movement. Among other measures, the party set up in the end a new bishop of Carthage, in opposition to Cyprian, and made a special effort to have the appointment acknowledged and approved at Rome. But all proved of small account. In the course of a few years, the new church seems to have ended in nothing.

In the mean time, however, a more serious schism had taken place in another part of the church. Novatian, a presbyter of

the church of Rome, had come to stand at the head of a party, which set itself in opposition to the regular bishop Cornelius. Ostensibly, the main question of controversy was the course of treatment to be pursued in regard to the lapsed. Novatian took the ground, that those who had thus fallen from the faith could in no case properly be received back again into the bosom of the church, but must be left to the uncovenanted mercy of God. In this respect, the schismatical movement at Rome was the direct opposite of that at Carthage; it taxed the discipline of the church with the want of that very severity, the exercise of which it was charged in the other case with carrying to excess. And yet that same Novatus, whose name figures in the Carthaginian faction, having made his way soon after to Rome, found no difficulty in making himself just as mischievously active here in the cause of Novatian as he had been before in that of Felicissimus. He seems to have been one of those restless spirits, with whom it is a sort of principle or maxim to go for any agitation that is against the existing order of things, and to whom the right of disorganization and revolution is especially *sacred*, whatever may be the occasion for its exercise. Cyprian, in one of his letters to Cornelius (Ep. 52), gives him a very bad character. In Rome now, however, he was all zeal for the cause of strict and severe discipline in the church; and it seems to have been through his turbulent activity in a good measure, that this cause was brought to take the form of an organized schism, by the pretended elevation of Novatian to the episcopate, in opposition to the regular bishop Cornelius. Efforts were made subsequently to carry out the organization in a wide form, and to have it acknowledged in other provinces. The body in communion with Cornelius was charged with corruption. This was to be on the contrary a pure church. Such plausible pretension in fact deceived many. The Novatian schism carried for a time quite a formidable aspect. Its day however was short. It had no power to stand against the authority of the Catholic Church. Excommunicated first by a council at Rome, the party labored in vain to have the sentence reversed or nullified abroad. Great pains were taken especially to gain the interest of the African bishops. But Cyprian took measures to have the case fully understood; and the result was, that the African church went fully in favor of Cornelius, and joined in the excommunication of the Novatians. The main significance of the schism was, in this way, that it formed a striking occasion for the development of the true idea of the Church, in its character of unity and wholeness, and furnished

at the same time a powerful and most instructive exemplification of the divine strength that belongs to this heavenly constitution, under such view, for the accomplishment of its own ends. The occasion did not create the doctrine of the Church, for which it became for all ages so conspicuous a theatre. It merely brought into view the fact, which it is the object of that doctrine to affirm and assert. The unity of the Church was the actual rock, on which the Novatian schism was dashed to pieces. The controversy lay between the authority of this supernatural constitution, regarded as a real historical fact in the world, and a simply human movement which affected to treat it as no fact by presumptuously thrusting itself into its place. No one saw this more clearly than Cyprian; and no one contributed more largely, or with greater effect, to place the controversy in its true light, and to bring out, in doing so, the high and solemn sense of that holy "sacrament of unity," as he terms it, in which is comprehended emphatically for all time the unconquerable strength of the true Catholic Church. Most of the letters we have from him during the pontificate of Cornelius, fifteen in number, are mainly occupied, directly or indirectly, with this great subject. It gave occasion also to his celebrated tract *De Unitate Ecclesiae*.

"Cornelius was made bishop," he says (Ep. 55), "by the judgment of God and his Christ, by the almost unanimous voice of the clergy, by the vote of the people as far as present, and by the collegiate action of a number of the best older bishops, when no one had been appointed before him, when the place of Fabian [his martyred predecessor], that is when the place of Peter and the dignity of the sacerdotal seat, was vacant; which having been thus occupied by the will of God and the firm consent of all of us, whoever may now pretend to be made bishop, he must be made necessarily on the outside, and can have no ecclesiastical ordination, as not holding the unity of the church. Be he who he may, and how much so ever he may arrogate to himself, he is profane, he is foreign, he is without. And since after the first there can be no second, whoever is made after one, who ought to be alone, he is not second now but none." Afterwards, coming to the person of Novatian he says: "It is not necessary to ask *what* he teaches, since he teaches without. Whoever and whatever he may be, he is no Christian who is not in Christ's church. Boast as he may of his philosophy, or make vain parade of his eloquence, the man who has not kept brotherly charity and ecclesiastical unity, has lost even all that he was before. Or shall he be counted a bishop, who,

where there was a regular bishop in the church consecrated by sixteen fellow bishops, intriguingly seeks to be raised to this dignity in a false and foreign form, by the help of deserters; and whereas there is from Christ one church divided throughout the world into many members, likewise one episcopate spread abroad by a concordant multitude of many bishops, *he*, after the order handed down by God, after this compact full unity of the catholic church everywhere settled, undertakes to create a human church, and sends out his new apostles to many cities to plant the authority of this recent institution, and while through all provinces and cities bishops have long since been ordained, venerable in age, sound in faith, tried in times of pressure and persecution, dares to create over these other spurious bishops of his own fabrication! As if he could overrun the whole world with the obstinacy of his new attempt, or dissolve the compact organization of the church by the dissemination of his discord; not knowing, that schismatics are always fervid at the start, but have no power to grow, or to carry on what they have unlawfully begun, wearing out with the failure of their own bad zeal." Even if he had been regularly elected and consecrated at first, he goes on to say, and had afterwards withdrawn from the unity of the church, his episcopate would by this fact alone have been made of no force. Only in the unity of the office, universally taken, can any single bishop have true jurisdiction or lawful power.

The tract *De Unitate Ecclesiae* is a formal exhibition and defence of this general proposition, that the Church in its universal catholic character is the one only Divinely constituted medium and channel of salvation, and that schism therefore, or separation from it, involves necessarily at the same time separation from Christ also and exposure to everlasting death. Open outward persecution, the author tells us, is not the only nor the worst form in which Christians have reason to fear the assaults of Satan. Such direct war is less dangerous, and more easy to be met and overcome, than his insidious approaches under the garb of friendship and peace. It is in this latter view especially, that he is called the Serpent. So he deceived our first parents. So he tried to deceive Christ also; but was defeated and foiled. We are required to avoid the first of these examples, and to follow the second. Thus only shall we win immortality in the footsteps of the Prince of Life. But how can we do this, unless we keep his commandments, hold fast to his prescribed rules? This alone, is to be truly grounded on a rock, such as no storms or tempests can shake. To believe in Christ, we must do what

he orders and requires ; we must keep to the true way of salvation. Without such inward settlement, we shall be as chaff before the wind. What could be more subtle than the machinations of Satan, as now put forth in the name and under the show of Christianity itself ? Seeing himself vanquished in the form of open heathenism, his altars forsaken, his temples deserted, through the growth of the new religion, he seeks now to reach by fraud what he has not been able to effect by force. "He invents heresies and schisms, to overturn faith, corrupt truth, rend unity. Those whom he cannot retain in the blindness of the old way, he circumvents and deceives by the error of a new course. He bears away men from the Church itself, and while they seem to themselves to have already come to the light and left the darkness of this world, he infuses into them again without their knowing it other shades of night ; so that although not standing with the gospel of Christ, and with his rule and law, they nevertheless call themselves Christians, and walking in darkness fancy that they have light, through the blandishing false art of the adversary ; who, according to the word of the Apostle, transforms himself into an angel of light, and passes off his emissaries as ministers of righteousness, asserting night for day, perdition for salvation, despair under pretence of hope, Antichrist in the name of Christ, so as by plausible lies cunningly to make void the truth. This comes, beloved brethren, by not going back to the origin of the truth, not seeking the head, not observing the teaching of the heavenly master."

For the determination of this rule, Cyprian goes on to say, there is no need of long discourse and argument. "A summary test of truth is at once at hand for faith. The Lord addresses Peter : I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven' (Matth. xvi : 18, 19). Again he says to the same, after his resurrection : 'Feed my sheep' (John xxi : 15, 17). [On that one he builds his church, and commits his sheep to him to be fed.] And although, after his resurrection, he gives like power to all the Apostles, and says : 'As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost ; whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them ; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained' (John xx : 21-23) ; still to make the unity clear, he provided by his authority that the origin of this same unity should start from one

(unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit). The other Apostles were also indeed what Peter was, endowed with like partnership both of honor and power, but the beginning proceeds from unity, [and the primacy is given to Peter, that there might be shown to be one church of Christ and one cathedra. They are all pastors, and there is shown to be one flock, which is fed by all the Apostles with unanimous consent,] that the Church of Christ may be demonstrated one. Which one Church also the Holy Spirit describes in the Song of songs, personating the Lord, where it is said: 'My dove, my undefiled is but one; she is the only one of her mother, she is the choice one of her that bare her' (Cant. vi: 9). Can one who holds not this unity of the Church, believe that he holds the faith? Will he, who withstands and resists the Church, [who deserts the cathedra of Peter on which the Church is founded,] presume still that he is in the Church, when the blessed Apostle Paul also sets forth the sacrament of unity in like style, where he says: 'There is one body and one Spirit, one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God' (Eph. iv: 4-6)?"

This unity the bishops especially are bound firmly to assert and maintain, so as to show clearly that the Episcopate itself also is one and indivisible. "Let no one deceive the brotherhood, let no one corrupt the truth of faith by treacherous falsehood. The Episcopate is one, the parts of which hold severally from the whole (*cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*). The Church also is one, which is extended into multitude by the force of its own fecundity; just as there are many rays of the sun, but only one light; and many boughs of a tree, but one trunk only firmly rooted in the ground; and as in the case of many streams flowing from a single fountain, however widely diffused the plentiful supply may appear, the unity is still preserved in the source. Tear a sunbeam from its place; the unity of the light suffers no division. Break off a bough from a tree; it has no further power of growth. Cut off a stream from its foun-

¹ The clauses which we have put into brackets in this passage have been regarded by some as spurious; although it is by no means settled, that the suspicion is correct. As to any theological interest that may seem to be at stake, however, the question is not of any account; since as Neander remarks, no less than Möhler, the clauses contain nothing that is not elsewhere affirmed by Cyprian, even more distinctly than here. They add but little indeed to the necessary sense, and plain purport, of their own context.

tain; it must soon become dry. So the Church of the Lord also, irradiated with light, sends out her rays over all the earth; still there is but one light, which is everywhere diffused, and the unity of the body is not divided. She spreads forth her boughs with exuberant growth through the whole world; she sends her abundant streams abroad, far and wide in every direction; yet is there but one head, one origin, one mother of continually prolific grace. Of her womb we are born; by her milk we are nourished; with her spirit we are animated."

The Church is the spouse of Christ. She only can bear children to God. Whoever is out of her, can have no part in the blessings of the Gospel. "He is a stranger, he is profane, he is an enemy. No one can have God for his father, who has not the Church for his mother. If one might escape who was out of Noah's ark, then may he also escape who is out of the Church." Not to gather with the Lord, is of itself to scatter.

This sacrament of unity, the writer tells us, was typically represented by the seamless garment of the Saviour, for which the soldiers cast lots. It is in truth, a mystery, closely related to the awful and glorious fact of the Trinity. The terrestrial constitution here has its root and force, we may say, in the celestial. Not to hold the unity of the Church, is not to hold the faith of the Father and the Son, not to hold life and salvation.

Thus we see the terrible nature of the sin of *schism*. It is full against the universal voice of the Scriptures. It is at war with the whole habit of faith, the whole mind of Christ. The temper which leads to it, is not of God but of the world; though it may be in the Church outwardly for a time, it forms no part of its true and proper life; it is there by accident; and when it comes to actual separation and secession, the process is only an act of self-judgment, a critical elimination from the body of Christ of an element which has been all along foreign and false. "Let no one imagine, that the good can depart from the Church. It is not the wheat which is carried away by the wind, nor a well rooted tree that is overthrown by the storm. Empty chaff is thus driven, and trees of small strength are thus violently laid low. To such the doom pronounced by the Apostle John refers: 'They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us' (1 John ii: 19)." Heresies and schisms come from the working of human corruption, refusing to own the obedience of faith; and they serve, as St. Paul says 1 Cor. xi: 19, to make manifest those who are approved, to separate the chaff from the wheat.

Let all then, who value their salvation, give good heed to the voice of God, charging and commanding them not to listen to the words of such false prophets. They prophesy, and cry peace; but it is not from the Lord. They have not been sent. "These the Lord describes, when he says: 'They have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water' (Jer. ii: 13). When there can be no baptism save one, they nevertheless pretend to baptize; while the fountain of life is deserted, they notwithstanding promise the grace of life giving and saving water. Men however are not washed there, but defiled rather; their sins are not purged, but only accumulated. That is no nativity to God, but a generation of children to the Devil." No such spurious filiation can bring with it true grace, or lead to heavenly life.

In vindication of their divisions, some quoted the passage which is so often abused for the same bad end in modern times: 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them' (Matth. xviii: 20). Cyprian however charges them with wronging the true sense of these words, by overlooking and keeping out of sight their occasion and connection. They rend the text, as they try also to rend the Church. The object of the passage, as the previous context shows, is to enforce unity, not division. The Saviour is speaking of the authority and power the Church has to bind and loose on earth, as being the organ and medium of a corresponding power in heaven. This goes so far, he adds, 'that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three &c.' The stress of the thought lies on the idea of that Divine concord, which is itself but another name for the life of the Church in union with her glorious Head. "Not multitude, but unanimity, is made to be of such vast account. If two of you, he says, shall agree on earth; the unanimity is put first, the concord of peace is made to go before, that we may agree with faith and firm effect. But how can he agree thus with any one else, who agrees not with the body of the Church itself and with the universal brotherhood? How can two or three come together in Christ's name, who are in palpable separation from Christ and his Gospel? For we have not separated from them, but they have separated from us, and inasmuch as heresies and schisms are of later birth, by setting up separate conventicles for themselves, they have forsaken the head and fountain of truth. Our Lord, however, speaks of his Church,

and says to those who are in the Church, that if they should be in concord, if they should when met together, though only two or three, unitedly pray according to his command and direction, they would be able, though but two or three, to obtain from the Divine majesty what they should ask. Wherever two or three are gathered together in my name, he says, I am in the midst of them ; in the midst of such, namely, as are simple and peaceful, such as fear God and keep his commandments. With such though only two or three he promises to be, as he was with the three youths in the fiery furnace, and because they continued simple towards God and of one mind among themselves, refreshed them with the spirit of dew in the midst of surrounding flames ; as he was with the two Apostles shut up in prison, who also were of like single and united mind, opening the doors of the prison, and placing them in public again to speak to the people the word they faithfully preached. When he lays down the rule then, ‘ Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,’ he does not sunder men from the Church, who has himself established and formed the Church ; but reproving discord to the unfaithful, and commending peace to the faithful, his language shows, that he is more with two or three only praying in unity than with the greatest number in dissent, that more may be obtained by the concordant supplication of a few than by the inharmonious prayer of many.”

How can they meet together with Christ among them, who come together on the outside of his Church ? That posture is of itself fatal to all faith and piety. “ Though such should be slain for the confession of the Saviour’s name, this stain is not washed out even by blood ; the inexpressible and dreadful guilt of discord is not purged even by such passion. He cannot be a martyr, who is not in the Church ; he cannot win the kingdom, who forsakes her that is destined to reign.” Schism breaks the law of peace and charity, which is of no less force than the law of faith. The greatness of this grace is set before us in full by St. Paul, in the thirteenth chapter of his First Epistle to the Corinthians. How can one have God, who has not charity ? He may give his body to be burned, but the sacrifice will profit him nothing. “ Such an one may be slain, but he cannot be crowned.” Even to prophesy, cast out devils, and do miracles, is not enough to insure salvation. There must be righteousness, to gain the favor of the Judge ; obedience to his precepts, that we may merit reward.

The spirit of schism, according to Cyprian, was no new thing ;

but it had assumed latterly a more than usually bold and active form—a proof, as he sees it, that the “perilous times of the last days,” foretold by the Apostle, were now actually at hand, and the world drawing towards an end. The faithful, however, should not be disturbed by this. Let them see in these apostacies and insurrections the clear fulfilment of prophecy, and be only the more firmly resolved to keep clear of all fellowship with every such unbelieving movement, however outwardly bold and strong. Let them bear in mind the judgment of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, and the punishment of King Uzziah, as monuments of the crime and danger of such rebellious independence to the end of time. Those who now pretended to set up a new jurisdiction in the Church, usurping the powers of the priesthood which God had himself established, must be regarded as falling into the same fearful condemnation with these ancient examples. To such applies the Lord’s word: ‘Ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition.’ This crime is worse than that of the lapsed, so far as they are brought afterwards to do penance and make full satisfaction for their sin. It is a more full alienation from the Church; not through compulsion, but of deliberate choice; not transiently but perseveringly; carried out by principle and maxim, and seeking to involve others in its own perdition. It leads, not to penitence, but to pride only and every new disorder. It is a lapse, not once merely, but every day; and martyrdom itself, which may be a passport to heaven in the other case, is shorn here of all worth and power.

Some confessors had been carried away by the false movement. But let not this create wonder or doubt. The merit of confession formed no security against the snares of the Devil afterwards, no immunity from temptation and sin. Of this, there were painful proofs in the disorderly and wicked conduct of some of the confessors under other forms. Solomon lost the grace he once had. A confessor may do so too. His confession is only the beginning of glory, not its end. It is an engagement to be true to Christ, which can continue to be meritorious only so far as it is sacredly kept, by a faithful observance of his institutions and precepts. Without this, what can it be but a source of greater guilt and heavier condemnation? The glory of the confessors as a body is not overthrown by such cases of defection; as the fall of Judas, the traitor, shook not the credit of the Apostolic college to which he had once belonged.

The conclusion is an earnest and powerful exhortation, to maintain unity, as the fundamental law of Christ’s house, the

necessary condition of charity and faith, in the observance of which only it is possible to be rightly prepared for the coming of the Lord. This is the posture of those, who wait for this glorious advent, with their loins girded and their lamps burning. "Let our light shine by good works, that it may lead us out of the darkness of this world into the light of eternal day. Let us anxiously and preparedly expect the sudden coming of our Lord, that when he shall knock, our waking faith may receive from him the reward of vigilance. If these commandments are kept, if these admonitions and precepts are observed, we cannot be overwhelmed asleep by the false power of the Devil, we shall reign as watchful servants in the kingdom of Christ."

Such is the general scope and sense of this remarkable tract of Cyprian, *On the Unity of the Church*. The same doctrine runs through all his works. We are made to feel its presence, indirectly at least and by implication, if not in a more open way, in almost everything he wrote. It was not with him an accidental opinion merely. As already remarked, it lay at the foundation of his whole theology. It entered into the inmost core and heart of his faith. He holds it not as a theory, resting on argument or speculation. His genius and taste lay not that way. The whole is with him an object of faith, a fact flowing with overwhelming force out of the constitution of Christianity itself, and clearly established by the voice of inspiration in the Holy Scriptures. He deals with it always in this universal view. It is for him the necessary form of the mystery of salvation. It conditions all his sense of what is comprehended in the glorious gospel of the Blessed God.

Cyprian's theology, like that of all the Fathers, is cast in the type or mould of the Apostles' Creed. All turns on the mystery of the Holy Trinity, exhibited in the way of real revelation through the mystery of the Incarnation. This stupendous *fact* carries in it the redemption of the world, by bringing into it a new and higher order of life, in the bosom of which it is made possible for the fallen posterity of Adam to surmount the law of sin and death, to which they are subject without hope in their natural state. The Word made Flesh is the ground and foundation of the whole constitution; which is thus throughout of a strictly supernatural character, and in such form is not to be apprehended without faith. By descending into the Virgin, we are told in the tract *De Idolorum Vanitate* §. 11, God so united himself with man, as to form a real mediation through the Son, by which men are conducted to the Father. "Christ consented to become what man was, in order that man also might have

power to be what Christ is." The Gospel thus is not a doctrine or theory merely of salvation; it is a revelation of *grace* and *truth* in living form, an actual economy of redemption brought to pass through the mystery of the Incarnation, and to be found nowhere else. As such an objective reality exhibited in this concrete way, men can have part in it only by surrendering themselves truly to its power. This they do by *faith* and *love*, which simply express the proper counterpart in such case of the truth and grace presented on the other side. These accordingly are the ground factors of Christianity and the Church. It is easy to see how such surrendry to the power of such a supernatural fact, if this itself be no dream and faith and love no delusion or hypocritical pretence, must draw after it with necessary consequence the character of unity in the Christian life, and how too such unity becomes a necessary mark and test of the reality of this life in its proper form. How shall the truth and grace of Christ, of whose fulness we are all required to receive and in whom only we can be complete, be ever otherwise than in full harmony with themselves? Or how shall faith and love stand in real, and not simply notional and visionary, communication with this new order of life, and not be the source of a corresponding unity? To receive here, is actually to pass over into the form of that which is received; and the receptivity must be ruled and filled absolutely by its object, in both forms: so as to be a full bowing of faith to the authority of it as truth in one direction, and a full submission of love to its claims as grace in another. To be out of unity thus, in either view, is to be out of Christ. Schism is as regards love, precisely what heresy is as regards faith; an act, which implies an inward falling away from what may be termed the fundamental law of Christianity, the law of implicit surrendry to the living fact of the Gospel, as the true end and proper whole of man's life. The unity of the Church comes then from its constitution. It does not depend on the thought and will of men. It is not such a union as results from the voluntary agreement of a number of persons, who happen to be of the same mind. The foundation of it is in God, in the mystery of the Trinity, in the fact of the Incarnation, back of all piety among men in its individual forms. Such individual piety comes only through the acknowledgment and appropriation of the truth and grace, which go before it in the mystery of godliness under its general and universal form. This is the true idea of the Holy Catholic Church, as an article of faith. It is a real constitution, of supernatural origin and force, which as such carries in itself its own

laws, its own attributes, its own prerogatives and powers, and refuses to come into subjection in any way to human opinion or human plan.

Of such constitution in its very nature, the Church is at the same time, according to Cyprian, not an idea simply or principle committed to the mind of the world and left to actualize itself afterwards in its own way, but a most positive creation like the world of nature, starting directly from God, and asserting its supernatural presence and power, from the beginning onward to the end of time, under a most real outward and historical form. As the Word, in becoming Flesh, was no Gnostic vision merely, but a real manifestation of God in human form, such as might be looked upon with the eyes and felt by the hands, so the new order of life which followed could not be without a corresponding organization, it was supposed, in and through which it should make itself felt among men through all ages. Such organization, to meet the demands of the case, must be not of men but of God; for only in such view could it truly contain and put forth the heavenly powers of which it is to be the outward body and form. The Church, accordingly, is of Divine institution outwardly as well as inwardly; fully as much so, according to this view, as the economy of the Old Testament. It is a system of law and precept starting from Christ, to which the blessings of the gospel are bound by heavenly ordination, and which men are required to acknowledge and obey as the necessary condition and only real medium of grace. Christ laid the foundations of the Church first in his own person, by his life, sufferings, death, resurrection, and glorification; and then in the mission of his Apostles, who after proper training were solemnly appointed to carry forward his work, and received power from on high at the same time for doing so with effect. The Apostolic commission was no doctrine merely, but a most real creation or constitution under a living outward form; which moreover, it was expressly declared, was to be of force to the end of time. As the living Father hath sent me, the Founder of Christianity says, even so send I you; the one mission is just the continuation of the other, and carries with it the same authority and force; he that heareth you, heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me, and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me. All power, he tells them after his resurrection, is given unto me in heaven and in earth: Go ye *therefore*—because it is so, and ye are to go in my name—and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;

teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you ; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. This was the guarantee, that their mission and work would not be in vain. He breathed on them, we are told in another place, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost ; whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained. This commission was followed soon after by a corresponding inauguration. Behold I send the promise of my Father upon you, the Saviour said before his ascension ; tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endowed with power from on high. The appointment, the solemn commission, the commandments and instructions which went along with it, were not enough ; there must be a real communication of supernatural power answerable to all this, by which the Ministry thus divinely constituted should become the channel, not in word only but in very deed and fact, of the new order of life which was now made complete for the world. This took place, as we all know, on the day of Pentecost ; when the Spirit which could not be given previously, "because that Jesus was not yet glorified" (John vii: 39), descended in full measure on the waiting and expecting disciples, as with the sound of a mighty rushing wind and in flames of fire, proclaiming by these sensible symbols that the promise was fulfilled, and immediately confirming by the gift of tongues the all sufficient nature of the grace it brought along with it for its own ends. Such, according to the evangelical narrative, was the origin and first constitution of the Christian Church. It is hard indeed to conceive of a polity more outwardly real, more objectively historical, having less the show of a mere doctrine, or carrying more completely the form of a living concrete fact.

So it was always regarded by Cyprian. He saw in the Church a real constitution, carrying in itself by Divine appointment actual supernatural and heavenly powers, of one order with the grace and truth brought to light by the mystery of godliness in Christ, and not to be found in the world under any other form. He took in earnest the conception of Head and Body, so frequently applied by St. Paul to this mystical relation ; looking upon the Church as in truth the fulness in this way of him that filleth all in all, and honoring it as the organ through which he is pleased to make his saving power known and felt among men. The whole economy, body and head, was for him a single grand fact, a new and extraordinary order of life with its own prerogatives, functions and powers, the origin of which was altogether above nature and only in God.

The notion of a simply human organization of the Church, a constitution founded on the will of men, and carrying with it no higher powers than such as might be taken to flow from the people for whose spiritual use it was established, was as far removed as possible from his thinking. The principle of Independency, the theory of Congregationalism, the idea of everything like ecclesiastical democracy or republicanism, lay heaven wide apart from the whole posture and habit of his mind. To found the kingdom of God in such style on the voice and will of men, like a confraternity of Free Masons, he would have considered the very perfection of rationalism and unbelief. To be the Divine reality it claims to be, it must come from above and not from below, its powers must proceed immediately from God and not from the people. Even the Presbyterian scheme was not enough for Cyprian, in this view. That scheme as it *once* stood, (not adulterated as we find it now for the most part by the Puritan idea of church democracy,) acknowledges a Ministry of divine origin, but not in the form of a hierarchy, with one order of office and power rising by divine right above another. It contends for the parity of the clergy, makes bishops to be of secondary growth and mere human arrangement, (*primi inter pares*, as the word goes,) with no rights or powers save such as have come to them by concession or usurpation from the body over which they are placed. We sometimes hear the *republicanism* of this system also paraded, on such account, as one of its special titles to confidence and praise. That precisely would have formed its condemnation in the eyes of Cyprian. He had no conception of an upward movement of powers here, whether by clerical or popular vote. The church pyramid, in his view, started from its own summit, not from its base. The only true order of its constitution, and so of the derivation of its functions and powers, was: Christ first, the head of the universal organism; then the Apostolate continued by regular succession in the Episcopate; then the Ministry in its lower orders; and finally the body of the people held in connection with the head through the medium of this hierarchy, which is thus Divinely ordained to be the one only channel of all descending communications of life and grace.

This excludes of course, not merely such rank rationalism as resolves the life of the Church into the will of mere natural humanity, in the style of such religious reformers as Kossuth, Kinkel, Mazzini, (who generously propose to settle by the world's vote what Christianity shall be, after they have cleared the world of what it pretends to be now); but it shuts out also,

what Cyprian would have regarded as only a more refined and plausible species of the same unhappy rationalism, the imagination, namely, that the supernatural economy of which Christ is the fountain and head comes to its actualization in some way or other first in the mass of believers, who then *as such* democratically organize the ecclesiastical polity in its higher forms—just as natural men are supposed to have the power of creating, in their own sphere, the corresponding polity of the State. This is the conception of the so called *universal priesthood* of Christians, which plays so important a part in certain schemes of theology. Cyprian knew nothing of it, in any such republican sense. All believers are indeed priests in his view, as they are prophets also and kings; but their prerogative in this respect forms in no sense the foundation or ground, from which the powers and rights of the Holy Ministry may be said to grow. The only order here is downwards, not upwards. The universal priesthood is not first under Christ, but last; it is not the basis of the proper hierarchy, but that in which this comes to its end. The bishops hold from Christ; the presbyters and deacons from the bishops; and *through* this constitution all priestly, prophetic, and kingly character, in any real form, descends to the people. The entire constitution in this view is held to be *jure divino* in the fullest sense, not a matter in any way of human policy or convention. The idea of a hierarchy of man's device, whether this be considered wise or foolish, upsets the whole sense of the institution; for then it must be regarded as having all its force from below, and not from above; and its pretensions to anything higher, if it make them, become then in truth both an usurpation and a sham. Cyprian had no thought of any such mournful pedantry as that. He was not a man to rest quietly in shadows and shams. He cared for no mock episcopacy, with mock powers, cocktail pretensions ending in mere sound and show. The entire force of the system lay, to his mind, in its *jure divino* character, in its supernatural authority, in its being a constitution which started from God, and carried in itself corresponding heavenly powers, under a real and not simply imaginary form, for the accomplishment of its own heavenly and supernatural ends.

In all this, there was no want of proper regard to the people. Their rights and privileges were fully recognized. They had a voice especially in the election of their chief pastors. Cyprian himself was in some sense forced to become a bishop, by the popular will. This however was at most only a nomination to office; the actual investiture came from another quarter. All

real ecclesiastical jurisdiction and power, it was well understood on all sides, came not from below but from above, not from the people nor through the people, but by the hands of the Ministry with strict apostolical succession from Christ.

With such real constitution, the Church is not to be regarded of course as springing from the Bible; as though God had given the revelation of Christianity only in such written form, and left it for men then to turn this text or copy into life as they best could. It is perfectly certain from the New Testament itself, that the great mystery of godliness was never committed in the beginning to any such helpless and wretchedly mechanical plan. It is as plain as the written text itself can make it, that the world was *not* thrown upon the Bible in the first place, to construct from it as to its own sapient mind might seem best the scheme of Christianity, to manufacture out of it the glorious fact of the Church in a form to suit its own judgment and taste. There is not a word in the Bible, which goes legitimately to support this monstrously rationalistic supposition; while the *Apostolical Commission* must ever be enough of itself for all truly believing and thoughtful minds, to cover it with confusion and shame. The Church is itself, according to the New Testament, a living constitution, not made of men after a supposed Divine prescription merely, but Divinely made, not an inspired doctrine simply but a supernatural reality and fact, built in a real outward way on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. So it is viewed always by Cyprian. No man could well make more account than he did of the Holy Scriptures. They were his continual study. He appeals to them as law and testimony on every occasion. His three books entitled *Testimonia*, addressed to Quirinus, are made up almost entirely of passages quoted from the Bible. But with all this, it never enters into his mind to make the Bible a fountain and rule of truth for the world *as such*, for the world *on the outside of the Church*, for the world in no union with the *living tradition of Christianity*, as a Divine fact handed down from the Apostles. On the contrary, he is of one mind here precisely with Tertullian and Irenaeus. The Bible is for him of authority only in the bosom of the Church. The New Testament grew out of this living revelation, supposes everywhere its supernatural presence, belongs to it exclusively in the way of rightful property, and can never be used safely except in believing submission to its authority and communion with its life. Heretics and schismatics, in this view, have no right to appeal to the Bible. It has to do with

an actual economy, in which they have no part, a world of positive realities which is for them as though it did not exist. What indeed can be more absurd, than to dream of separating the letter of Christianity from its own proper life? It is as though the blind should undertake to correct by the science of optics, the familiar experience of those who see; or as if some bold and pertinacious somnambulist might pretend to set aside by logic, the verities of the waking world. Natural philosophy and logic as related to the system of nature are of force only in the bosom of this system, as an actual felt and acknowledged fact; and just so we may say, that the proper use of the Bible, as a rule of faith and practice, in its relation to the sphere of grace, is necessarily conditioned also by the authority of this higher order of things, or in other words by the living tradition of the Church, felt and acknowledged to be a fact in the same way.

Starting in this way from the Apostolical commission, and bearing throughout the character of an independent supernatural constitution, the entire structure of the Church rests, for Cyprian, on the *Episcopate*. This he holds to be the strict succession of the Apostolate. The powers of the Church are carried forward by this channel alone. Here is the foundation of its unity and strength. Every bishop, in his proper sphere, is a representative and organ of the Divine Head, from which the whole body derives its life. He is the regular bond of union and communion thus, between Christ and the congregation over which he presides. To despise his authority, is the very spirit of heresy and schism. "Our Lord in the Gospel," Cyprian writes (*Ep. 66, ad Pupianum*), "when many of his disciples left him, turning to the twelve said: 'Will ye also go away?' Peter answered him: 'Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe and are sure that thou art the Son of the Living God.' Peter speaks there, on whom the church was to be built, teaching and showing in the name of the church, that however the rebellious and proud multitude of those who are unwilling to obey may depart, still the church does not turn away from Christ, and the church for him is the people in union with the priest, the flock adhering to its own pastor. Whence you ought to know, that the bishop is in the church and the church in the bishop, and that if any one be not with the bishop he is not in the church; and that those flatter themselves in vain, who not having peace with the priests of God pretend to communicate with certain persons in a surreptitious way, since the church, which is catholic and one, is not rent nor divided, but is in truth firmly joined and soldered to-

gether by the close mutual conjunction of the priests." In another place (Ep. 33, addressed to the Lapsed,) he says: "Our Lord, whose precepts and directions we are bound to obey, settling the honor of the bishop and the plan of his church, in the Gospel, thus addresses Peter: 'I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and on this rock, &c.' Matth. xvi: 18, 19. From hence flows down through the change of times and successions the ordination of bishops and constitution of the church, that the church may rest upon the bishops, and every act of the church be governed by these rulers. Such then being the order established by Divine law, I marvel, that some of you have audaciously presumed to write to me *as in the name of the church*, when the church is constituted by the bishop and clergy with all who are in good standing" The same general thought we meet with in Cyprian's writings over and over again. The divine right of Episcopacy is perpetually asserted, or taken for granted, as a fact lying at the very foundation of the universal scheme and constitution of the Christian Church.

To be the foundation of unity for the Church however, in this broad view, the Episcopate must be in unity with itself. No bishop can be said to be the organ and representative of Christ, in virtue of what he is simply in his single and separate capacity. To be such an organ, he must be comprehended in the whole organism of which Christ is the head. His office can never be of force, except in union and harmony with the entire office of which it is only a part. "Episcopatus unus est," we are told, "cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur" (De Unit. §. 5). Again it is: "Episcopatus unus, episcoporum multorum concordie numerositate diffusus" (Ep. 55, *ad Antonianum*); so that Novatian's attempt to bring in new bishops, to get up a hierarchy in certain places in opposition to the one already established, was perfectly absurd as well as profane. Even if he had been himself regularly consecrated, (which was not the case,) he could have no power to start another ministry in any such irregular style. "No one can have either the power or the honor of the episcopate, who retains neither the unity of the episcopate nor its peace." So, writing to Stephen of Rome (Ep. 68,) in reference to a certain Marcian, one of the bishops of Gaul, who was reported to have given in his adhesion to Novatian "forsaking the unity of the catholic church and the harmonious consent of its priesthood," Cyprian urges him to address letters to the other bishops of that province requiring them to take measures for the proper care of his flock in some other way. "For the numerous body of the priests is joined togeth-

er by the cement of mutual concord and chain of unity on this account, that if any one of our college shall attempt to create heresy and so to lacerate and waste the flock of Christ, the rest may bring help and as good and compassionate pastors gather the Lord's sheep into the flock. -- For although we are many pastors, we feed nevertheless one flock, and are bound to look after all the sheep which Christ has purchased by his blood and passion." The solidarity of the Episcopate then is no division properly speaking of its powers; it does not weaken the force of the office in single cases, but only makes it full and complete; every bishop in his sphere is armed with the jurisdiction of the universal college, and is to be regarded in fact as an overseer of the whole church; just as the Apostolate was not the sum simply of the several trusts belonging to its membership, but belonged to each Apostle in full as his own commission. In both cases, however, the trust in such form was strictly collegiate. It could have no force, save in the solidarity of the Divine constitution, out of which it sprang, and from which alone also it derived all its significance and truth.

Cyprian has a very high sense, in this view, of the prerogatives and rights of each bishop in his own see; and he is often appealed to by modern Episcopalians, accordingly, as a powerful witness for what is sometimes called the independency of the common episcopal office, over against the pretensions of the see of Rome. No one indeed could well go farther than he does, in magnifying this office, as one directly representing among men the supreme authority of Christ. In this respect, all bishops are for him of like dignity and co-ordinate power. He writes to Stephen, bishop of Rome, in the tone of a colleague possessing the same rank with himself; and he did not hesitate even, when the question arose concerning the baptism of heretics, to take ground openly against him, as Paul withstood Peter to the face, charging him with error and overbearing presumption.

All this, it must be allowed, is not answerable exactly to the order of the Papal system, as we find it established in later times. The relation between the see of Rome and the other sees would appear to have been more free and independent altogether, than it came to be afterwards. The supremacy of the Pope was not in Cyprian's mind, or at least is not in his writings, as it rules for instance in our day the thinking of Wiseman or Hughes. But we must not make more of this point than it will properly bear. The idea of a strict independency in the jurisdiction of bishops, we have already seen to be most perfectly at war with

Cyprian's scheme. The Episcopate is one first, and then manifold; the unity must go before the distribution; the independence can hold only in union with the solid corporation out of which it grows. Sundered from this, it becomes at once schism and death. It can never generate or uphold a true and valid church life, in the form of Novatianism say, or *Anglicanism*. The first condition of all real episcopal jurisdiction and power, is that it shall be truly of collegiate force, the exercise of the office under its universal or catholic view. But this now, in the nature of the case, implies and demands an actual outward order or system of some kind, by which the conception of such wholeness shall be properly secured and made good. 'The idea here, if it is not to end in an empty abstraction, must take the form of fact. As the church at large must be held together by a real bond in the episcopate, so this again must be bound like an orb or sphere to some single centre, that shall be the principle or beginning of its unity in a like actual view. So much is at once implied by the solidarity of the office. There can be no such consolidation even in the way of outward league merely, and still less in the way of inward living organism, without a real primacy at some point to support and represent the whole.' Such an actual primacy and real centre of unity for the universal Episcopal college, there can be no reasonable question or doubt, Cyprian habitually saw and acknowledged in the pontificate of the Bishop of Rome; which was regarded as flowing, with such right of priority, from the place originally assigned to Peter by our Blessed Lord himself in the joint commission of the Apostles.

This is plainly intimated, in what we have quoted from the tract *De Unitate Ecclesiae*. It lies in the universal argument of this tract; since the real unity it asserts necessarily requires the supposition of an actual centre somewhere, and all goes at once to fix it at Rome and nowhere else. We may say the same of Cyprian's doctrine of the Church, wherever it comes into view. It runs always with inevitable logic to this conclusion. Without it, the doctrine is a mere solecism. But what

¹ 'The Anglican Episcopate finds its centre to some extent in the See of Canterbury, but still more effectually in the Royal Supremacy. The King or Queen, as the case may be, is with most terrible reality, and not simply by fiction of law, Head of the Established Church. Our American Episcopacy has not yet got a fixed centre of any sort. It is Congregational. But this is a suicidal anomaly; which the hierarchy must overcome in some way hereafter, if it is to be of any lasting account.

is thus implied is also amply enough expressed, not only in this tract, but also in other places. So in his letter to the people of his charge on the faction of Felicissimus, which we have before quoted, we hear him say, that "there is one church, and one cathedra founded by the Lord's voice upon the rock,"¹ and no room on account of the one altar and one priesthood for the establishment of any other. So, Ep. 70, to Januarius and others: "There is one baptism, and one Holy Ghost, and one church founded by Christ the Lord on Peter with origin and plan of unity (*super Petrum origine unitatis et ratione fundata*)."² Again, Ep. 73, to Jubaian: "It is plain where and by whom the remission of sins can be given, which is granted in baptism. For to Peter first, on whom he built his church and from whom he instituted and shows the origin of unity, our Lord gave that power that what he loosed on earth should be loosed in heaven. And after his resurrection, he addresses also the Apostles, saying, As the Father hath sent me, &c." In the same epistle afterwards we are told, that the church "is one, and has been founded by the Lord's voice upon one, who also received his keys." Peter is the centre of the Apostolate, and so the real beginning of the actual organization of the Church; but this was no temporary order only; the Episcopate finds a corresponding centre in the *Cathedra Petri* at Rome, as the necessary starting point of unity in the same way. Thus, writing to Cornelius, bishop of Rome, of the attempt made by Felicissimus and his party to get up a new bishop at Carthage, (Ep. 59,) Cyprian says; "They dare to make voyage, with letters from profane schismatics to the see of Peter and the chief church, whence the sacerdotal unity is derived, &c." Again in another letter to the same Cornelius (Ep. 48), he says expressly that the Roman church was to be acknowledged as "the root and mother (*radix et matrix*) of the catholic church," and that communion with its bishop was the test of abiding in catholic unity and charity.³

The point is too plain to admit of any doubt. But this is not all. It is no less certain, that the view of Cyprian here was no peculiarity properly speaking of his own; it belonged to the

¹ Or as a different and better reading gives it, *super Petrum*, "on Peter."

² "Nos enim singulis navigantibus, ne cum scandalo ullo navigarent, rationem reddentes, scimus, nos hortatos eos esse, *ut ecclesiae catholicae radicem et matricem agnoscerent ac tenerent*."—"Placuit, ut per episcopos . . . per omnes omnino in provincia ista positos literae fierent, sicuti sunt, ut te universe collegae nostri et communicationem tuam, *id est catholicae ecclesiae unitatem pariter et caritatem probarent firmiter ac tenerent*."

age. He may have led the way in asserting the full sense of the church system at some points; but the elements of the system were all previously at hand in the actual constitution of the church as it then stood. The very title *cathedra Petri*, in such familiar use, is one proof of this. Neander thinks it may have been first used in a merely ideal sense for the episcopate as a whole; but the supposition rests on no historical evidence whatever, and is in its own nature highly improbable. It grew, no doubt, from the notion of an actual continuation of Peter's primacy in what was regarded from the beginning as Peter's see. The celebrated letter of the Oriental bishop Firmilian against Stephen, translated and preserved in Cyprian, though sometimes quoted to show the contrary, goes in fact fully to establish this affirmation. His whole argument turns on the unity of the church; which Stephen is charged with forgetting and disregarding, because he acknowledged the baptism of heretics to be valid. The blindness of this must be felt, he thinks, when it is remembered that in founding his church the Saviour gave the power of remitting sins first to Peter alone, and afterwards to the Apostles only; which accordingly was confined to the churches established by these legates, "and the bishops who have succeeded them by vicarious ordination." All who set up any other altar or priesthood on the outside of this "one catholic church of apostolical succession," are involved in the guilt of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, and must look for like punishment. "And in this view," he goes on to say, "I feel indignant at the plain, palpable folly of Stephen, that he, who thus glories in the place of his episcopate and claims to hold the succession of Peter, on whom the foundations of the church are laid, should bring in many other rocks and establish many new church structures, by maintaining with his authority that baptism has place there." This is not certainly to dispute the primacy of Stephen, or to charge him with usurping for his see as the *cathedra Petri* a dignity which did not belong to it in fact. It is just the reverse. All goes to show, that Stephen was known to claim such central relation to the universal episcopal college, by right of succession from Peter, and that this claim was sustained by the general consent and tradition of the church. What offends Firmilian, and brings him to speak disrespectfully of the bishop of Rome, is that he should turn the weight of his high station in favor of the baptism of heretics; and pains are taken to make it appear, that by so doing he virtually stultified his own prerogative, by doing away with the very foundation on which it was taken to rest. For if there could be a valid bap-

tism on the outside of that one catholic church which was built upon Peter, it would follow that there might be other churches also on other foundations; and what must become then of the famous primacy of Rome? The argument involves an unbecoming sneer; but it is by no means simply *ad hominem*; the whole force of it turns on the assumption, that the theory of the catholic church which gave rise to Stephen's pretensions was in itself true, and known and acknowledged to be so on all sides.

The Church then, of which such vast account is made by Cyprian, was no idea merely or theory, but a well defined objective and historical reality, a most real corporation of which the whole world had knowledge and might take account. It was the so called *Catholic Church*, which held its rights by direct succession from the Apostles, (a succession about which there could be *then* certainly no possible mistake.) held together throughout the world by a common Apostolical Episcopate, and having its acknowledged centre through this in the See of Peter at Rome. It is to this most real corporation, and not to any abstraction of vague and indeterminate bounds, that the law of unity, which he takes to be so essential to the idea of Christianity, is applied by him in all its uncompromising force. This precisely is the *Noah's Ark*, on the outside of which there is no salvation. Here, in this empirical catholic church, thus openly defined and circumscribed as a body in harmony with itself, and here only, were to be sought and found all the Divine properties and supernatural powers, which belong of necessity to the true idea of the church as an object of faith. This is the glorious constitution founded on Peter. This is that illustrious *Mother*, the Immaculate Spouse of the Incarnate Word, of whom it is said: "*Illius foetu nascimur, illius lacte nutrimur, spiritu ejus animamur;*" and to whom is at once referred the awfully solemn and most pregnantly significant old oracle: "*Habere jam non potest Deum patrem, qui Ecclesiam non habet matrem.*" Here reside all grace and truth. The mystery of godliness is there in both forms, to be submitted to by men with corresponding self-surrendry of charity and faith. Not to own it, is to fall into heresy or schism; which involve each other in the end, and either of which must be regarded as fatal to that whole posture of "obedience to the faith," in which St. Paul makes the idea of Christianity so comprehensively to stand. To be separated from the church, is to be separated from the promises, to have no part nor lot in the privileges or hopes of the gospel. No one in such state can be a true friend or sincere follower of Christ. "*Alienus est, profanus est, hostis est.*" Schism is always dam-

nable and damning. It strikes at the root of the CHRISTIAN FACT; for that Fact is not confined to the mystery of salvation in Him who is the Head of the Church, but must be of perennial force in the Body also over which he thus presides, as the proper continuation of this same mystery "always even unto the end of the world." Schism destroys the very substance of grace. "Quidquid a matrice discesserit seorsum vivere et spirare non poterit, substantiam salutis amittit." It is a sin, for which not even the merit of martyrdom itself can make any satisfaction. It is a perpetual apostacy, which makes all acts of religion, while it lasts, absolutely worthless and vain; for it is in truth the full verification, we are told, of what St. Paul says 1 Cor. xiii: 1-3: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels—have all gifts—give my body to be burned, and have not CHARITY; I am as sounding brass; it profiteth me nothing."

The maxim, *No salvation out of the Church* (*extra ecclesiam salus nulla*), amounts of course at the same time to an assertion, that full salvation is to be found in the Church, that what is needed for this object is here really and truly at hand under a supernatural form. In Cyprian's scheme, accordingly, all that is embraced in this proposition holds good of the empirical catholic communion, in which only the church had for his faith the character of objective reality. Separation from this real constitution brought with it guilt and perdition, just because truth and grace were actually comprehended in it, under the most real view, for the purposes of salvation. In the bosom of the Church, answerably to the figure of Noah's ark, was wafted, as it were, on the face of the deep and high above the surrounding desolation of nature, the mysterious presence of a new and higher order of life. The whole constitution was above nature, a sacrament, a Divine mystery; which however was really in the world under an outward and historical form, and carried in itself really and truly the supernatural powers that were needed for the accomplishment of its own more than natural ends. These powers start in Christ, and can never be absolutely divorced from his person. But from him as the Head, they flow over into his Body, *τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληροῦμεν*. The channel of this communication is the Apostolic Ministry; whose original commission remains always in force, and must be taken as a full guaranty, to the end of time, of the actual sufficiency of the office for such high purpose and design. No bishop, no church, is with Cyprian, as we have seen, a fixed and settled rule. Not to hear and obey the bishop, is to despise

the authority of Christ. Not to be in communion with the bishop, is to be out of communion with the fountain of all grace and life. The bishop is the source of power to the common priesthood ; by the intervention of which then, the word is made to take effect, the sacraments have force, and all spiritual blessings are conveyed in a real and not simply imaginary way to the people.

This whole view comes out most amply and explicitly, in the controversy which was raised concerning the baptism of heretics. With our present Protestant habit of thought, that old controversy altogether is apt to seem of no great interest or account. With the doctrine of the church which prevailed in the third century, however, it was in fact of the very highest significance ; and all that is needed to make it of interest still, is that we should be able to reproduce in our minds in some living way the idea of this doctrine as now explained. The controversy throws light on the doctrine, and shows at the same time how extensively and profoundly it had entered into the mind of the universal early church. Could there be any valid baptism among heretics ? This was the question. A large and respectable party took the ground, that no such baptism had any force, and that heretics coming into the church must be baptized over again, as being in truth before without the sacrament altogether. Cyprian went zealously for this view. Stephen, Bishop of Rome, took the other side, governed as he said by previous tradition ; and in the end, as is well known, this Roman decision prevailed, and became the acknowledged law of the Catholic Church. With the history of the controversy, and its proper merits, we are not now concerned. Its bearing on the subject before us is all we care about at present. This is at once full and plain. Cyprian argues at large against the validity of baptism among heretics, from the familiar view that all grace in the church is bound to its catholic organization, and must flow through the channel of the regular episcopate and priesthood. This is the basis of his whole opposition. The thought comes up from all sides, and in all forms. Baptism, he assumes, involves of necessity the present action of the Holy Ghost, which is to be found only in the Church of true Apostolical succession ; and to this, it then follows, the sacrament must be necessarily confined.

"It is absurd," he writes Ep. 74, *ad Pompeium*, "that whereas the second nativity is spiritual, by which we are born in Christ through the laver of regeneration, they should say one may be spiritually born among heretics, where they deny that the

Spirit is. For water alone cannot purge sins and sanctify a man, if it have not also the Holy Spirit. Whence, either they must concede that the Holy Spirit is there where they say baptism is, or else there is no baptism either where the Holy Spirit is not, because baptism cannot be without the Spirit. But what a thing is it to assert and contend, that they may be the sons of God who are not born in the church. For that it is baptism by which the old man dies and the new is born, the blessed Apostle shows and proves when he says: 'He hath saved us by the washing of regeneration' (Tit. iii: 5). But if regeneration be by washing, that is by baptism, how can heresy generate sons to God through Christ, not being the spouse of Christ? For it is the Church alone, which by conjunction and union with Christ generates children spiritually, according to the word of the same Apostle: 'Christ hath loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify it, cleansing it with the washing of water' (Eph. v: 25, 26). If this therefore be his beloved spouse, which is alone sanctified by him and alone cleansed by his washing, it is manifest that heresy, which is not the spouse of Christ and cannot be either sanctified or cleansed by his washing, is not able to generate children to God."—Again: "It has been handed down to us, that there is one God, one Christ, one hope and one faith, one church and one baptism established in this one church; from which unity if any one depart, he must be found necessarily with heretics, by defending whose cause against the church he makes war upon the sacrament of divine tradition. This sacrament of unity is represented to us in the Song of songs: 'A garden inclosed is my sister, my spouse, &c.' (iv: 12). But if the church be an inclosed garden and sealed fountain, how can he enter into the same garden or drink of its fountain, who is not in the church? So Peter himself also, in demonstration of unity, has taught us that we cannot be saved except by the one baptism only of one church. In the ark of Noah, he says, 'a few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water; the like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us' (1 Pet. iii: 20, 21). How brief and spiritual a compend, to exhibit the sacrament of unity! For as in that baptism of the world, by which its old iniquity was purged away, whosoever was not in the ark of Noah could not be saved through water, so now also no one can be saved by baptism who has not been baptized in the church, which our Lord has founded in unity after the sacrament of one ark."—Again in the epistle *ad Iubrianum*, after the passage before quoted, showing that the power of remitting sins in baptism flows from the commission of

our Lord, given first to Peter, "super quem aedificavit ecclesiam et unde unitatis originem instituit. et ostendit," and then after his resurrection to the Apostles generally, it is added: "We see from this, that only those who are set over the church by evangelical law and the Lord's ordination can baptize and give remission of sins, while nothing can be bound or loosed on the outside, where there is no one who has power either to bind or loose." Then follow the familiar examples of Korah and his company, and of Aaron's sons offering strange fire on the altar. Afterwards the church is compared to the garden of Eden; its members to trees, of which any that fail to bring forth good fruit must be hewn down and cast into the fire. "These trees she waters with four rivers, that is, the four Gospels, by which she bestows with heavenly inundation the grace of salutary baptism. Can he irrigate from the fountains of the church, who is not within the church? Shall he be able to impart to any one the salubrious and saving draughts of paradise, who disobedient, and of himself condemned and banished from the fountains of paradise, pines away and dies with the drought of eternal thirst?" This shows strikingly the relation, in which the use of the Scriptures, as well as of the means of grace generally, is regarded by Cyprian as standing to the Divine constitution of the Church. These streams of life are *not* for private judgment, and independent use, on the outside of this sacred inclosure; they belong to the garden, whose walls are obedience and faith, and only *there* can they serve truly their heavenly purpose. "The Lord cries," our author proceeds, "that if any one thirsts he should come and drink of the rivers of living water that flow from his person. Whither shall he come who thus thirsts? To heretics, where the fountain and river of living water is wholly wanting, or to the church, which is one, and has been by the Lord's voice founded upon one, who received also his keys. One she is, who holds and possesses all the power of her Spouse and Lord. In her we preside, for her honor and unity we contend, her grace as well as glory with faithful devotion we maintain. We by Divine permission water the thirsting people of God, we keep the bounds of the living fountains."—Elsewhere we are told, that no supposed soundness of doctrine, on the part of those who are out of the church, can be taken here as of any account; it is simple alienation from the church itself, that makes all ministrations on the outside of it to be of no force or worth whatever. "Should any one object, (Ep. 69, *ad Magnum*), that Novatian holds the same law which the catholic church holds, baptizes with the same symbol

that we also use, acknowledges the same God the Father, the same Christ the Son, the same Holy Ghost, and that so he may usurp the power of baptizing because he seems not to differ from us in the interrogation of baptism—let such an objector know first, that there is *not* one law of the symbol common to us with heretics, nor the same interrogation. For when they say: ‘Dost thou believe the remission of sins and the life everlasting by the holy church?’ they lie in the interrogation, since they have no church. Then again they confess themselves with their own voice, that remission of sins cannot be given except through the holy church, and not having this they show that with them no sins can be forgiven.”

These passages may serve as specimens. Many pages might be filled with quotations in the same general strain. No salvation out of the church; full possibility of salvation in the church, because *there*, and *there* only, the supernatural grace required for this end was, by Divine constitution, exhibited and made present for the obedient use of faith in an actual and real way. This is everywhere Cyprian’s doctrine, and it is referred to everywhere as the reigning doctrine of the age. That it was so in fact, there is no room for even the shadow of a doubt. Firmilian’s long letter, before mentioned, presents in full the same view as common to the Oriental church with the Latin; for it may be said to echo every sentiment on the subject, that is to be found in Cyprian. “All power and grace,” he says in particular, “are established in the church, where the elders preside, who also possess the power of baptizing and laying on hands and ordaining. For as it is not lawful for a heretic to ordain, so neither also to baptize, nor to perform any sacred and spiritual function, as being estranged from the source of sanctity (*quando alienus sit a spiritali et deifica sanctitate*). All which we some time since affirmed, in council at Iconium in Phrygia, assembled from Galatia and Cilicia and other neighboring regions, as something to be firmly held and asserted against heretics—a doubt having been raised in regard to it by some persons.” It was a public decision thus, made by a large portion of the Church in Asia Minor. “The power of remitting sins,” he says, after quoting the commission first to Peter and then to the Apostles as a body, “was given thus to the Apostles, and to the churches founded by them as Christ’s legates and the bishops who have succeeded them by vicarious ordination. When now enemies of the one catholic church in which we are, and adversaries of us who have succeeded the Apostles, arrogate to themselves illegal priesthods in opposition to us, and set up profane altars, what

else are they than Korah and Dathan and Abiram, sacrilegious with like crime, and doomed to like punishment, along with all who favor their cause—as *their* friends and partizans also shared their miserable fate!” The same general theory is presented to us again, in the broadest and strongest terms, by the *Apostolical Constitutions*, a work which is generally supposed to have taken its present form about the middle of the third century.

The idea of a Church which is thus the organ and medium of grace in a real way, whose office it is, not simply to proclaim salvation, but with supernatural power also to bring it actually to pass, involves at once a corresponding view of the Holy Sacraments. They must be, not signs and pictures only, but seals and vehicles of the grace they represent. What *Baptism* in particular was to the faith of Cyprian in this view, our quotations have already plainly enough shown. These however are a mere fraction of the testimony to the same purport, which it would be easy to furnish from his writings. Baptism is for him everywhere the sacrament of regeneration, the mystery of the new birth, the real ground and foundation of spiritual life. It never seems so much as to enter his mind, that there can be any question made of this in the Church. To doubt it, would be, in his system, to doubt the supernatural realness of Christianity itself. This assumes throughout, that nature in man is fallen, without strength and under a curse; that what is born of the flesh is flesh; and that provision is made for his redemption by a new and higher order of life, which no less real than nature itself, but of another form altogether, starting from Christ and sustained by the Holy Ghost, is of force to set aside the old curse, and to “condemn sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law may be fulfilled in those who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.” The true conception of the new birth thus, is not the stimulation of mere nature in any way as such, whether by human or supposed divine influence, but the actual introduction of the natural man into this higher order of life, the *supernatural* sphere of the Spirit, bringing along with it the real possibility of salvation. This supposes at once a Divine act; which was regarded always by the early Church, accordingly, as having place in the mystery of Baptism. He that believeth and is baptized, the Apostolical commission runs, shall be saved. Faith is submission to the new order of life supernaturally offered in the Church; and its proper complement is the heavenly reality of this grace itself, meeting it as God’s act and seal in the laver of regeneration. Baptism in such view is of course, as the old creeds have it, “for the remission of sins.”

It is a real translation from the sphere of nature, the fallen-life of Adam, over into the sphere of truth and grace, the full possibility of righteousness and eternal life, which is revealed in Christ.

How real all this was to Cyprian is shown, most impressively and affectingly, by the account he gives of his own conversion, in the passage we have already quoted on this subject from his tract *De Gratia Dei*. He had felt the darkness and misery of nature; but despaired of help; till he was brought finally to bow to the hope set before him by the Church, and to offer himself, as a catechumen nearly fifty years old, for admission into its mystic inclosure. He had found it hard to believe, "that a man might be born again, and that being animated into a new life, through the laver of saving water, he might lay aside what he had been before, and though retaining the same bodily frame put on an entirely new mind and spirit." But this great mystery became real to him, through the actual experiment of submitting as a little child to the authority of Christianity in its own proper form. He believed, and was baptized; and his baptism was to his faith a real response of grace on the part of heaven, bringing with it the complete power of salvation. "When by means of the regenerating wave, (*undae genitalis auxilio*), the stain of my former life was washed away, and the serene and pure light of heaven descended into my sin-cleansed bosom; as soon as the second birth, by the Spirit derived from on high had transformed me into a new man, (*postquam coelitus spiritu hausto in novum me hominem nativitas secunda reparavit*); presently in a wonderful way doubts began to be settled, perplexities to solve themselves, and obscurities to grow plain; there arose strength for what before seemed difficult, and power to do what was before held to be impossible; making it clear, that the first natural life in the service of sin was of the earth, and that what the Holy Ghost had now breathed into me was of God."

How it may be with others, we know not; but on our own mind, we confess, such a testimony, on such a subject, coming from such a man, falls with uncommonly powerful and solemn impression. In what startling contrast it stands, with the reigning so-called *evangelical* tone and style of the present day! Which is to be regarded as right, and which wrong, the voice of the ancient church in Cyprian, or this unsacramental modern voice? We pretend not here to answer the question. It is one however of most profound significance and interest, which the thoughtful may well be asked to lay seriously to heart. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

That Cyprian's voice here was in fact that of the universal ancient church, is beyond all doubt. The controversy concerning the baptism of heretics proceeds throughout, as we have already seen, on the supposition, that the sacrament is of real force for the remission of sins, and carries in it objectively the sense and power of the new birth. The question also in regard to the forgiveness of mortal sin after baptism, which was a source likewise of no small difficulty to the early church, turned always, as we may at once see, on the same theory. For our modern Puritan habit of thought, there is no meaning in either of these old Catholic questions. Both of them are felt to be of antiquated interest, of no real difficulty, and of only small account. All that is needed however to make us feel their ancient significance, is some due apprehension of what baptism was held to be in the period to which they belong. In the age of Cyprian, no one questioned its power to take away sin and to produce regeneration, who did not mean at the same time to question the whole fact of Christianity. It was a settled maxim: "*Omnia delicta in baptismo deponi*" (*Test. III. §. 65*). It was a thing understood and acknowledged on every side, that all "*qui ad divinum munus et patrimonium baptismi sanctificatione perveniunt*," all who are made Christians by the sanctification of baptism, "*hominem illic veterem gratia lavacri salutaris exponunt, et innovati Spiritu sancto a sordibus contagionis antiquae iterata natiuitate purgantur*," put off there the old man through the grace of the salutary laver, and being renewed by the Holy Ghost are cleansed from the defilement of the old contagion by a second birth.

Infant Baptism, in this view, comes to its proper significance. Infants need the grace which the sacrament brings as much as others, and no age is to be shut out from the benefit of a salvation which God has provided for all; "*Deus, ut personam non accipit, sic nec aetatem*." If even the greatest sinners of full age are not to be refused the grace of baptism for the remission of sins, "how much less should it be refused to an infant, which being recently born has not sinned at all, except as by natural generation from Adam it has brought along with it in its first birth the contagion of the old death, and for which the way to obtaining the remission of sins is so much the more easy, as the sins to be remitted are not its own but those of another." So Cyprian writes, (*Ep. 64, ad Fidum*), in the name of a whole council of African bishops, in resolution of the doubt, not whether infants might be baptized at all, (nobody then, it seems, made any question of *that*,) but whether it was necessary to

defer their baptism till the eighth day, as in the case of circumcision among the Jews. The unanimous judgment is, that no such limitation was to be allowed. "Nulla anima perdenda est," they say; on which account, "universi judicamus nulli homini nato misericordiam Dei et gratiam denegandum." The first birth makes room and creates occasion immediately for the second.

The same real force Cyprian sees always in the mystery of the *Holy Eucharist*. It is for his faith an actual sacrament, and not merely an outward monument or sign. As regards the mode of the communication it offers with the body and blood of Christ, his language is indeed more general than precise; but it is abundantly clear as to the fact. Writing on the petition in the Lord's Prayer, *Give us this day our daily bread*, (*De Oratione Dominica* §. 18), he says that Christ is the bread of life for his people, "qui corpus ejus contingunt," and so we are to pray that no serious sin may intervene to hinder our daily participation of the heavenly bread of the eucharist, and so of his body or flesh which he declares to be given for the life of the world. "Since then to eat of this bread is to live forever, as it is plain that those live who touch his body and receive the eucharist by right of communication, so on the other hand we must fear and pray lest any one, by being separated from Christ's body through prohibition, remain far from salvation, since he himself warns us, *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall have no life in you*. And so we pray that our bread, that is Christ, may be given to us daily, that we who abide and live in him may not recede from his sanctification and body." This makes the eucharist at once the communion of the real flesh and blood of the Son of Man, according to the awful mystery of his own words in the sixth chapter of John. Hence the stress we find laid on it, as a real Divine viaticum, a source of strength and fortification against evil, for all great emergencies in the Christian life. A striking exemplification of this we have in the course pursued with regard to excommunicated penitents. Their probation was long and severe. But the danger of death in any case might bring it to an end. They must be strengthened for the last conflict by receiving the Lord's body. So when a new persecution was expected, we find this indulgence made general. "It was proper," Cyprian writes (*Ep. 57, ad Cornelium*), "that the term of penance should be protracted, with relief to the infirm at death, whilst there was rest and tranquillity allowing such delay with the tears of mourners and such succor to the dying

at the last hour. But now peace is needed, not for the infirm, but for the strong, and communication is to be given by us, not to the dying, but to the living; in order that we may not leave unarmed and naked but may fortify with the protection of Christ's body and blood, those whom we excite and exhort to battle; and that, inasmuch as the eucharist is for the purpose of a defence (*tutela*) to those who receive it, we may arm those whom we wish to be safe against the enemy with the fortification of the Lord's fulness. For how can we teach or urge them to shed *their blood* in the confession of Christ's name, if *his blood* be not allowed them for the struggle? Or how shall we prepare them for the cup of martyrdom, if we do not admit them first to drink the Lord's cup by right of communication in the church?"

Intimately connected with this idea of the mystical presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament of the Supper, as the bread of life, is the persuasion and belief that the service carried in it the force of a sacrifice or offering. In whatever sense the mystery involves communion with Christ's body and blood, it is with his body, we know, as broken, and with his blood as shed for the remission of sins. It is as comprehending in them always the force of the atonement wrought out by his bloody death, that his flesh is thus meat indeed, and his blood drink indeed, for the use of a dying world. That atonement, in such view, is no past transaction merely, but a fact "once for all," the power of a perennial indissoluble life, always of force in the Saviour's person. In such form, it must of necessity go along with the sacramental exhibition of his "flesh given for the life of the world." It will be there, so far as the exhibition itself is a reality and no dream, not as a remembered doctrine merely but in its own actual virtue and power as a sacrifice always well pleasing unto God. In this way no idea is more familiar to the mind of the ancient church, than that by which the eucharist is regarded as a service analogous with the offerings of the Old Testament. The passage: "In every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and *a pure offering*" (Mal. i: 11), is taken to be thus literally fulfilled. We have seen how Cyprian speaks continually of the "altar" and "priesthood" in this relation, and of "offering" or "sacrificing" as terms of one import with the celebration of the Lord's supper, in the known and familiar church phraseology of the time. Memorable especially is the language he employs on the subject, Ep. 63, *ad Cuccilium*. With reference to the typical priesthood of Melchisedek, he says: "Who is more a priest of the Most

High God than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered sacrifice to his Father, and this the same that Melchisedek offered, that is, bread and wine, namely his own body and blood ;” after which we are told, that Melchisedek offered an anticipatory image of Christ’s sacrifice in the form of bread and wine, “*quam rem perficiens et adimplens Dominus panem et calicem mixtum vino obtulit, et qui est plenitudo veritatis, veritatem prefiguratae imaginis adimplevit ;*” language that looks at once to the eucharist, as the abiding verification of what in the other case was only picture and shadow. Then further on it is said : “ If it is not lawful to alter the least of our Lord’s commandments, how much less may we thus make free with such great and weighty regulations relating to the very mystery itself of the Lord’s passion and our redemption, or change them by human authority into anything else than what God has appointed. For since Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, is himself the High Priest of God the Father, and has offered himself first as a sacrifice to the Father, and commanded to do this in remembrance of him ; that priest, it is plain, truly officiates in Christ’s place, who imitates what Christ did ; *and he then offers in the church a true and full sacrifice to God the Father*, when he sets himself to offer according to what he sees to have been offered by Christ himself ”

The sacrament of the altar in this way becomes the centre of the universal Christian worship. All is a solemn *λειτουργία* revolving round the shekinah of this mysterious presence. The unutterably glorious as well as awful REALITY which is here brought into view, is felt to underlie and bind together the whole new order of life to which it belongs ; sending its pulsations, like a mighty heart, over the mystical body, and making it to be in truth the “ communion of saints.” Hence those “ commemorations” of the martyrs, which Cyprian made so much account of celebrating in this way.¹ Hence the idea of a certain benefit to the dead, through the power of this sacrifice performed on their account. Cyprian refers in one place to an established ecclesiastical rule, denying such posthumous privilege in a particular case of offence. The case itself is characteristic. It was that of nominating a priest, by last will and testament, to act as a secular trustee or guardian. This was

¹ *Ep. 30. Sacrificia pro eis semper, ut meministis, offerimus, quoties martyrum passiones et dies anniversaria commemoratione celebramus.—* So also *Ep. 1.* before quoted.

regarded as something profane; for which reason, "there must be no offering made for the offender, no sacrifice rendered for his repose; he deserves not to have his name mentioned at the altar of God in the prayer of the priests, who has sought to call off from the altar the priests and ministers of God."² The same idea of reconciling power was attached to the use of the eucharist, as we have already seen, in the restoration of penitents to the peace of the church. The conscience must be purged "with sacrifice and under the hand of the priest." All prayers and supplications, as well as alms and good works of every sort, were regarded as acquiring new force when backed and supported by these altar solemnities, as truly as a like real benefit was believed to have been derived in such cases from the more ancient shadowy sacrifices of the Jewish law.

It is in full agreement with this whole doctrine of what the Church is as the real organ and medium of salvation, that Cyprian lays so much stress on the solemnity of penance and absolution in the case of the lapsed, as the necessary condition of their being restored to her communion and peace. There was a terrible reality in such a fall. The excommunication it brought with it was felt as a present actual calamity and curse. In these circumstances it became as much a necessity to be reconciled to the church, as it was to be brought into it at first by baptism. The case was not one for mere private repentance. It was not enough for the offender to think of settling it between his own conscience and God. There must be an application to the church for help; there must be full confession made to the ministers of religion; there must be a long course of contrition, with deprecatory prayers and other signs of grief; and then in the end, after all this, must come the priestly absolution, opening the way to the life giving communion of the Redeemer's body and blood. All this was held to be something vastly more than simple ceremony or show. It was the order which God had been pleased to establish, for the actual recovery

² *Ep. 1. Quod episcopi, antecessores nostri religiose considerantes et salubriter providentes censuerunt, ne quis frater excedens ad tutelam vel curam clericum nominaret, ac si quis hoc fecisset, non offerretur pro eo, nec sacrificium pro dormitione ejus celebraretur. Neque enim apud altare Dei meretur nominari in sacerdotum prece, qui ab altari sacerdotes et ministros Dei voluit avocare.*" We may see at once, how this goes to show a general unquestioning consent on the part of the church, as it then stood, in the Catholic maxim, that prayer and the offering of the eucharist in behalf of the faithful dead are of true wholesome account for their repose.

of men from the guilt and power of sin. It carried in it the force of a real remedy, for what must prove otherwise a mortal and wholly incurable disease. Cyprian does not call it a sacrament exactly, as we now use the term; but it has for him undoubtedly all the elements of what is called the sacrament of penance in the Roman Church. Absolution in this way was held to be of force on earth for the actual forgiveness of sins in heaven. It must be secured accordingly by all means, before passing out of the world by death. Hence the indulgence granted to penitents *in extremis*; "because there is no exomologesis in hades (*apud inferos*), and to encourage penance, it must be made sure of its fruit" (*Ep. 55, ad Antonianum*). Just as infants are to be baptized (*Ep. 64*), because "*quantum in nobis est, si fieri potest, nulla anima perdenda est.*"

And yet Cyprian taught no magical or merely mechanical salvation. The absolution of the church might be gained by false pretences; it might be granted rashly; but then it would have no force in the other world. Hence the danger of hasty restorations, in the case of the lapsed. Such indulgence tended to destruction, not to salvation. The wound must be thoroughly probed and cleansed, in order that there might be a radical cure. Dying penitents must indeed be absolved; in which case, however, "the Lord will ratify our judgment here only if he find the penitence of the sinner full and right; but should any one have deceived us by a feigned repentance, let God, who is not mocked and who sees the heart, perfect our defective inquisition, and the Lord make good the judgment of his servants." Over against all undue regard to the intercession of the confessors and martyrs, the people are reminded (*De Lapsis*), "that the Lord alone can have mercy upon men, and he only impart forgiveness of sins committed against himself, who has borne our sins and suffered on their account;" and also (*Ep. 27*), "that the martyrs make not the gospel but the gospel makes the martyrs." So the sacraments used unworthily; we are continually told, produce death only and not life.

Some may find here a contradiction in Cyprian's system. Neander seems to charge him in this way with some want of consistency. But the difficulty comes from a false apprehension of what is to be understood by objective grace, or the *opus operatum* rightly so called, in the ministrations of the church. To say that certain conditions are required on the part of the subject to make such grace of effect, and that the failure of these may turn it into a nullity or something worse, by no means implies that the same grace is without real power for the accom-

plishment of its own ends where conditional room is made for its action in this way. In the sphere of nature, causation and condition come before us under such necessary connection on all sides; and no good reason can be assigned, why a similar realistic order should not be allowed to have place also in the supernatural economy of the Holy Catholic Church.

Neander however sees a falling away from the original genius of the Gospel, in this whole Cyprianic doctrine of the outward church. The mind of the age, he thinks, had taken a wrong direction, and Cyprian became a leading organ in helping it forward in what he is pleased to denominate "a relapse to the Old Testament standpoint," which had been at first happily left behind. Bursting the shell of Judaism, we are told, Christianity had in the beginning, with the help of St. Paul especially, triumphed over the Jewish tendency and asserted successfully the proper freedom and spirituality of its own nature. "In the Gentile congregations the new creation was fairly revealed. But the surmounted Jewish view forced its way in again from another side. Humanity could not yet maintain itself on this height of a purely spiritual religion; for the mass who were to be educated first into the apprehension of pure Christianity, weaned first from Paganism, the Jewish standpoint was more near; out of Christianity accordingly, after it had reached its independence, a standpoint was again evolved analogous with that of the Old Testament, a new externalization of the kingdom of God, a new discipline of law, that should serve afterwards for the training of barbarous nations, a new guardianship for the mind of humanity till it should attain to full grown manhood in Christ." This rehabilitation, once commenced, proved to be of most fruitful progress, our historian tells us; and so we have a ready rule at once in hand, if we trust his guidance, for disposing of all the pontifical, churchly, and sacramental ideas, that come before us so thickly in the religious life of the third century. They are to be set to the account simply of this old most unfortunate, though it would seem highly necessary, *Rückfall*, on the part of Spiritual Pauline Christianity, *auf den alt-testamentlichen Standpunkt.*¹

This is characteristic. The great German master of church history has a theory of his own with regard to the true nature of Christianity, which he reads of course without difficulty into the New Testament, and particularly into the writings of St.

¹ K. G. B. I. S. 330, ff. (2te Aufl.)

Paul. It is eminently spiritualistic, much of one sort in truth with the mysticism of the Quakers, and not far removed at times from the dry rationalism of the Baptists. But the church life of the third century is plainly enough constructed throughout, on an altogether different scheme. So far as this variation goes, Neander now must necessarily find it by his own rule out of right form and shape; and so the next thing is a hypothetical speculation, to account smoothly for the somewhat remarkable fact. This, it will be observed, rests on no historical basis whatever. It is taken from the cloud land simply of his own brain, like a vast deal more that we meet with in the landscape painting of the same distinguished writer. All comes to this only, that Neander's preconception here is contradicted by the actual state of things in the time of Cyprian, and *therefore* the time of Cyprian must be a departure, in the direction of this difference, from the original sense and spirit of the Gospel. It never seems to enter the mind of the great man, that the false reckoning might be on his own side possibly, and not with the age which is thus conveniently put in the wrong. Why should the judgment of Neander after all be taken as at once conclusive in such a case, against the judgment of Cyprian and the whole early church? The matter speaks for itself, we are told; this Cyprianic system carries in it evidently a strong analogy with the religious polity of the Old Testament. Suppose it does. Was not this polity then of Divine constitution? Was it not a real theocracy? Was it not ordered and framed with reference to the Gospel? And why then should that be taken at once for a false construction of Christianity, by which it is made to appear a true completion of Judaism, carrying out the sense of its shadows in the form of corresponding glorious realities? But the genius of the new religion, we are told again, is spiritual and free. That is most true. Must it follow from this, however, that it is Gnostic, a thing of mere subjective experience and dreamy speculation? What if the very idea of spirituality and freedom here be, not the unbound action simply of man's mind in the sphere of nature, but its introduction by faith into the sphere of truth and grace, as a higher order of life brought home to it in an objective way by the power of the Ho'y Ghost? Cyprian saw just this mystery in the Church. It was to him a real revelation of the grace it proclaimed. Its charter was taken to be, not fiction, but fact. It was a true supernatural polity, starting from the skies but permanently settled upon the earth. Under its forms went the active presence of what they were employed to exhibit and represent, the very substance of

VOL. IV.—NO. IV.

the things which had been presented before only in the way of shadow and type. And who will say, that such a real revelation of the Spirit, if a simple actuality and no dream, would not be something sufficiently spiritual, or that the power of acknowledging it by faith might not be after all the best kind of freedom, and not a necessary falling back merely upon the Jewish standpoint for the education of unripe nations? We question much if Paul ever thought of asserting any other spirituality and freedom than this, in the name of the Gospel. The issue before us regards then just the truth of this ancient conception of the mystery of the Church. Neander's criticism assumes that the conception was visionary and false; that no such Divine polity, as Cyprian fondly dreamed, with heavenly functions and supernatural powers, was ever really at hand in its historical constitution. Grant that, and the rest follows easily enough. But other consequences also come painfully into view, for a thoughtful mind. Are we prepared for any such ominous concession? If not, what becomes of this whole judgment; Cyprian may be right after all, we repeat, and Neander wrong.

The church question as forced upon us by the writings of Cyprian, it is plain to see, is something a good deal deeper and more solemn than the controversy between Anglican Episcopacy and the rest of the Protestant world. We do not deny at all the importance of this controversy in its proper place; and for Episcopalianism as a system, it is hardly necessary for us to say, we entertain no small amount of veneration and regard. We do not deny too that Cyprian, who has been called the Ignatius of the West, bears ample testimony, like his predecessor of this name in the East, to the existence of Episcopacy, as an institution held to be of Apostolical origin, in the early church. But it is most plain at the same time, that we are not carried by it as a separate interest, in any way, to the last ground of the system to which it originally belonged. Mere episcopacy was not enough by any means, in the judgment of these ancient times, to uphold a true church succession; it must be the office in unity with itself under a catholic form; the office as representing the undivided and indivisible Apostolical commission, on which as a rock centering in Peter the Church was to be built to the end of time. Along with this go corresponding apprehensions of the attributes and powers of the Church, which our modern Protestant Episcopacy either rejects altogether, or turns into affectation and sham. The two systems are of altogether different constitution; and it is perfectly idle to think of establishing an identity between them, on the ground simply of their having

in common the office of bishops. What charm can there be in an episcopate, that this rather than any other fragment of Peter's ship as it originally sailed towards heaven, should be taken to carry away with it now, *as a fragment*, the power of a true church life? No. Anglicanism is not Cyprianic Christianity. The question of Episcopacy is in truth of only secondary and very subordinate account. The grand issue always, is that which lies between Protestantism and Romanism. This we are bound to look solemnly in the face.

J. W. N.

THE APOSTOLICAL ORIGIN OF INFANT BAPTISM.

[From Schaff's "*Geschichte der Chr. Kirche.*"]

As the apostolic church was a missionary church, the most of those baptized into it, were grown persons. Infant baptism has force and meaning, only in the fact of a parent church already existing, and the presumption of Christian education, which of course could not be expected of heathen or Jewish parents. Thus in our day, a Missionary begins his work, with the instruction of adults, not with the baptism of children.

The question, however, presents itself, whether, in addition to the baptism of adults, which, in the nature of the case, took place most frequently, there was not also in congregations already established the Christian baptism of infants, similar to circumcision, its type, which, the patriarch Abraham having first received as a seal of the righteousness of faith, (Rom iv: 11,) forthwith performed upon his son Isaac, on the eighth day after his birth (Gen. xxi: 4); and which was made the sign of the covenant to all his posterity, (Gen. xvii: 10, &c.). This question, we feel bound to answer affirmatively, although in doing so, we have opposed to us, not only the Baptists, but also the authority of some distinguished Pædo-baptist divines; for instance, the venerable *Dr. Neander*, who denies that infant baptism was practised in the apostolic church.¹ It is true, there is no direct historical proof in support of it, to be met with in the letter of the N. T. nor in those passages in the Acts of the Apostles, in which the baptism of whole families is spoken of (Acts xvi: 15-30-33; xvi: 8, comp. x: 44-48 and 1 Cor. i: 16) inasmuch as children are not expressly mentioned, and it is possible that the families were composed exclusively of grown persons. Still less is there any passage to prove the contrary. We must have recourse accordingly to the spirit of the bible, which contains far more than is just expressed by its letter; and if it thence appears that infant baptism is necessarily included in the very draft and design of primitive Christianity, we will be able, in the total absence of proof to the contrary, to arrive at tolerable certainty that it was actually practised.

¹ A. H. I. 278. &c. Still, we must not overlook this important distinction, that according to Neander, infant baptism was developed from the pure spirit of Christianity, although it was not practised until towards the close of the second century, whilst the Baptists pronounce it to be an unscriptural and unchristian innovation.

The strongest ground in favor of infant baptism, in connexion with and as a part of a well ordered Christian church, and with a sufficient guarantee of a pious education—for it is only upon this condition that we maintain it at all—lies in the universality of the very idea of Christ, which includes humanity itself. He is both able and willing to redeem all men, of every age and sex and description and condition of life. In the presence of the Saviour of the world, all these distinctions are lost in the general need and capacity of all men for salvation. A Saviour, who was only able and willing to save adults and not infants, would not be the Christ he is represented to be in the Gospel. There is no warrant whatever, in the word of God, for the exclusion of a part of our race, on account of their age, from the blessings of the kingdom of heaven, and our best feelings, and deepest and most inward religious consciousness revolt at a particularism, so gross as this.* In the significant parallel, Rom. v: 12, &c., the Apostle makes it very prominently to appear that the kingdom of righteousness and life, according to its divine intention and inward power, is altogether as comprehensive, indeed still more comprehensive and effectual, than the kingdom of sin and death, to which it is admitted children are subject, and that the gain and advantage secured to us by the second Adam far more than compensate for the loss and injury received from the first. It is for this reason, he repeats the expression, “much more,” in the second member of the sentence, (ver. 15

* And yet this is the inevitable consequence, and in fact the very principle assumed as a primary truth, by the Baptists. Dr. Alexander Carson their most learned apologist, asserts without reserve in his work (*Baptism in its mode and subjects*, p. 173,) that children cannot be saved by the Gospel, or by faith. “The Gospel has nothing to do with infants; nor have Gospel ordinances any respect to them. It is good news; but to infants it is no news at all. They know nothing of it. The salvation of the Gospel is as much confined to believers, as the baptism of the Gospel is. None can ever be saved by the Gospel who do not believe it. Consequently by the Gospel no infant can be saved.” When therefore Baptists assume, as they generally do, that children are saved, without baptism or faith, or the Gospel, they upset the fundamental principle of Christianity that out of Christ there is no salvation, and that by faith in him only are we saved. “Infants who enter heaven,” says Carson, “must be regenerated, but not by the Gospel. Infants must be sanctified for heaven, but not through the truth as revealed to man.” (Is there then any other truth for this purpose, than that which is revealed? If there is it must be a contradiction, and such an outward anti-evangelical truth can never be saving.) “We know nothing,” he adds, “of the means by which God receives infants; nor have we any business with it.” Precious comfort to be sure for Christian parents, particularly, when standing by the graves of their children!

-17). As is Jesus himself, so is his church exalted above every limitation of nationality and tongue and kindred and age. The similitude of the leaven, which leavens the whole lump (Matth. xiii : 33) is intended to represent the inward power of the kingdom of God to pervade all classes and conditions of human life, and when the Lord, after the solemn declaration that all power in heaven and earth was given him, commands his disciples, to make disciples (*μαθητεύειν*) of *all nations*, by baptizing them in the triune name, and by teaching them his doctrine; there is no reason to think that it was to be limited to those who were of mature age. Or do none but adults belong to a nation, and not youth and children and infants?

In harmony and close connection with this, is the beautiful idea, so clearly expressed already by *Irenaeus*, the disciple of Polycarp, and the faithful bearer of tradition from within the sphere of the labors of St. John, namely, that Jesus Christ became a child to children, a youth, to those who were growing up, and a man to those of mature years, and in thus entering into the various states and stages of the development of man's earthly life, he sanctified every age and period of life, his infancy, as well as his adult age.¹ According to the Baptist view, the childhood of Christ is robbed of its deeper significance and most precious comforting efficacy.

But now, on the other hand, *Faith* is necessary as the indispensable condition of salvation, as the organ by which we embrace Christ and appropriate to ourselves his benefits; and here it is that we come into conflict with the main exegetico-dogmatic argument of the Baptists. Christian baptism, as they say, presupposes, objectively, the preaching of the gospel, subjectively, repentance and faith; infant children, however, can neither

¹ Irenaeus says, adv. Haeret. III, 22, from a most inward consciousness of the full meaning of the incarnation, omnes enim per semetipsum venit salvare, omnes, inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes et parvulos et pueros et juvenes et seniores. Ideo per omnem venit aetatem et infantibus infans factus sanctificans infantes, in parvulis parvulus, sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes aetatem, simul et exemplum illis pietatis effectus et justitiae et subjectionis, in juvenibus juvenis, exemplum juvenibus fiens, et sanctificans Domino. That, by renascuntur in Deum, Irenaeus refers to baptism, as the sacrament of regeneration, by which the infant is dedicated to God, Neander himself admits in his Eccles. Hist. vol. I, p. 537, where amongst other things said concerning this expression of the Church father, he adds, "Thus, the practice of infant baptism is derived from the deepest conception of the very nature of Christianity, ruling our minds upon the subject."

understand preaching, nor can they repent and believe; therefore they ought not to be baptised. As it regards this, the major proposition is correct enough, the minor, in this expanded form, is false, and with it the conclusion falls to the ground. The connexion of baptism with the preaching of the gospel, and with faith, is beyond dispute evident, in part from the words of the institution of the sacrament, Matth. xxviii: 19, and particularly Mark xvi: 16, "He that (*first*) believeth, and (then) is baptized, shall be saved," and in part from the examples given us in the Acts of the Apostles, according to which, the preaching of the missionary and the faith of the hearer, always precede and prepare for the baptismal act, Act. ii: 37, &c.; viii: 5, &c.—35—38; ix: 17; x: 42—48; xvi: 15, 33; xviii: 8; xix: 5. But here, we must not forget the limitation, overlooked by the Baptists, that in all these instances, the instruction given was very brief and summary, a mere announcement of the principal historical events of the gospel, and with it, but a low grade of faith, previous to their introduction into the church, and that their more perfect instruction in the apostolic doctrine, and their growth and improvement in faith took place after their regular connexion with the church. Primitive Christian baptism was neither compulsory, as for instance, the baptism of the Saxons by the command of Charlemagne, nor yet a mere baptistic form, communicating nothing that was not possessed before, but simply sealing and confirming the already existing life of faith. The Apostles never demanded formal regeneration as a *condition* of baptism, but the earnest sincere longing of the soul after salvation in Christ, which was actually proposed and offered in baptism, and was sealed and afterwards developed and promoted by the other means of grace. "Repent," said Peter to the three thousand, who, on the day of Pentecost, after hearing with an earnest desire for salvation a single brief discourse, were baptized, "and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Thus he places, both these blessings, the negative and the positive as the fruit and effect, not as the preliminary condition of baptism. This view is also confirmed by the frequently misunderstood passage, Matth. xxviii: 19, which should be rendered, according to the original: "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all nations, (by) baptizing them (*βαπτίζοντες*) in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and (by) teaching (*διδασκοντες*) them to obey all that I have commanded you." Here it is evident that "to make disciples" to Jesus (i. e. true Christians) is not one and the same thing as

"to teach,"¹ but comprehends more than this, and indicates the object to be attained in the use of both the means to be employed, baptism, and the teaching which is to succeed it.² If it were possible to become a confirmed Christian without baptism, and so also without a connexion with the church, the church would be altogether useless, at least not necessary, and to this the Baptist theory also conducts, which always misapprehends the nature and pedagogical significance of the church, as an *institution* indispensable to salvation, and considers it simply in its ground as an *association* of saints. Besides to insist upon regeneration and conversion as a necessary preliminary condition to baptism renders this also impossible, or at least requires that it should be indefinitely postponed; inasmuch as God has not furnished us with the gift of infallibly searching the heart.

As it respects, however, the second proposition in the Baptist argument, that is the inability of children to believe, from which is deduced their inadmissibility to baptism: we admit it fully, if by faith we are to understand, a *self conscious free* surrender of the heart to God. This can only take place after we have attained to consciousness—and for this we can fix upon no definite period—and thus infant baptism needs to be subjectively completed by means of catechetical instruction and confirmation, in which the believer having attained to spiritual maturity confirms his baptismal vows, and with full and free determination gives himself up to God. For this reason too, the baptism of the children of unbelievers, though they may be professing Christians, has really no significance, and is a profanation of this sacred rite, inasmuch as in such cases there is no sure warrant for the religious education and training demanded by the baptismal vow. The great error of that assertion, however, lies in this, that the conception of faith generally, and with it the efficiency of the Holy Ghost, is bound to a particular stage of the development of human consciousness, and is made dependent upon it. The true ground and condition of salvation lie generally, not in any thing subjective, as belonging to the creature, but in the depths of the divine compassion; and in faith itself we

¹ The Lutheran interpretation here is inaccurate and misleading, in rendering μαθητεῖν also, to teach.

² Dr. H. Martensen, the Danish divine, is accordingly perfectly correct in saying (Christ Baptism, and the Baptist Question. Hamb. 1843, fol. 34), "The more general infant baptism becomes in the world, the more fully are the words of the Saviour accomplished, that the nations, are made disciples, by baptism and teaching."

must be careful to mark different grades, from the first bud, to the ripe fruit. It commences already with our religious susceptibility and unconscious yearning towards God, and a childlike confidence in a higher power. It is not altogether a product of our own thinking or knowing, or feeling, or willing, but it is a work of grace and of the Divine Spirit, limited to no age, or stage of consciousness, but is like the wind which bloweth where it listeth, and when and whither it will.¹ Faith does not produce the blessings of salvation, it only receives them, and only in the receptive way, as the organ of appropriation, and not as productive, is it saving in its operation, inasmuch as otherwise, our salvation would flow forth from a creature source. This receptivity for the divine, is to be found however already in the child, and indeed purer, and less obscure than in later years. By virtue of its religious constitution and frame of mind it is accessible to the influences of grace; and may really be born again. To deny this, is to send all children without exception to hell. For they too have been conceived in sin, (Ps. 51 : 5.) are flesh born of flesh (John iii : 6), and by nature the children of wrath (Eph. ii : 3 comp. Rom. iii : 22-24.) and without being born again of water and the Spirit, no one can ever, according to the unequivocal and express declaration of the Lord Jesus, enter into the kingdom of God, (John iii : 5.). "He that believeth not shall be damned." Mark xvi : 16. When therefore Baptist divines admit at least some children into heaven without regeneration and faith, they must to be consistent hold the Pelagian view of original sin and guilt or else open another way to salvation, of which the gospel knows nothing, and which stands in open contradiction to all this. There are however, in the scriptures, passages directly to the point, which place this susceptibility of the infant mind to Divine influences, beyond all doubt. If we even overlook the remarkable case of John the Baptist, who, "in his mother's womb, before he was born," was filled with the Holy Ghost (Luke i : 15-41), we nevertheless are assured from Matth. xviii : 2-5 ; xix : 14, 15 ; Mark x : 14, 15 ; Luke xviii : 16, 17, that the Saviour of the world himself took children into his arms, and blessed them, and spoke to them encouragingly of the kingdom of heaven ; declared indeed peremptorily, that adults themselves must become children again, must partake of their simple, confiding, susceptible dis-

¹ Comp. such passages as Rom. xii : 13 ; Gal. v : 5 ; 1 Cor. xii : 3-9 ; 2 Cor. iv : 13 ; Eph. ii : 8 ; Col. ii : 12 ; Phil. i : 29 ; Jno. iii : 8.

positions, in order to have part in the kingdom of heaven. Shall the Church then refuse baptism to those dear little ones, whom the Son of God embraced? Shall the Church reject as incapable and unworthy of her communion, the very persons, whom the Head of the church held forth as a pattern to all who wished to be his disciples? It is much more reasonable to infer from all this, strange as it may seem, that *every baptism, even that of grown persons, is in fact infant baptism*, inasmuch as Christ has declared the childlike spirit to be an indispensable condition of our entrance into his kingdom; and as baptism, moreover, as the sacrament of regeneration, demands of every one receiving it, penitentially to forsake their previous evil ways, and in faith to commence a *new* course of life consecrated to God.

The same objections, which are urged against the Christian baptism of infants, may with equal plausibility be made against the Jewish rite of circumcision on the eighth day. For this too was not an unmeaning ceremony, but a holy sign and seal of the covenant, by which the person circumcised assumed the obligations, and at the same time was admitted to the privileges and blessings of the covenant of the law, (Gal. v: 3), which strictly taken could in like manner only be done, after he had attained to self-consciousness, and in the exercise of his own free will. If however, it be said that the circumcision of the Jewish children rested upon a divine command as is undeniably the case, Gen. xvii: 12, Levit. xii: 7, we can nevertheless, from this type derive a strong argument in favor of infant baptism, inasmuch as this has in a manner, certainly taken the place of the other, and for this reason is called the "circumcision of Christ," (Col. ii: 11, 12) with this great difference, it is true, that the ancient covenant, with all its arrangements was nothing more than a shadow of better things to come, whilst the new covenant of grace is the image and essential reality itself (Heb. x: 1, Col. ii: 17). If then the first, according to the promise of Jehovah (Gen. xvii: 7, &c.) includes the whole posterity of Abraham, why this much more, far surpassing as it does the other in riches and fulness and depth. In this comprehensive sense, and in accordance with the analogy of the command of circumcision, must the Apostles as Jews have understood the injunction of the Saviour to baptize all nations, and if the children were to be excluded it would be some where mentioned. In fact, Peter at the feast of Pentecost in calling upon his hearers to be baptized, expressly declares this extension of the blessings of the gospel to children: "For the promise (the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost) is to you, and your chil-

dren, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.”

This important idea of an organic connexion between Christian parents and their children, and their being included in the same covenant duties and privileges meets us also in the writings of St. Paul. He regards the children as already belonging to the congregation, and enjoins upon them to obey their parents, “in the Lord,” Eph. vi : 1, Col. iii : 20, which properly speaking, is only possible upon the presumption of their being engrafted into the body of Christ, and this is effected by baptism. In 1 Cor. vii : 14, he makes a very significant distinction, between heathen and Christian children, and speaks of the first as unclean (*ακαθάρτα*), the latter on the contrary as holy (*αγία*) in virtue of their organic connexion with a believing father, or believing mother. As in a mixed marriage, of which he is speaking immediately before, the mightier divine power of the sanctified Christian wife prevails over the darkness of her heathen husband, so she also exerts a controlling influence upon their posterity. God is stronger than Satan. How much more must this be the case, when both parents are walking in the fear of God, and are thoroughly pervaded by the Spirit of faith ! By all this, Paul does not pretend to deny the natural corruption of the children of Christians ; but he teaches unequivocally that the blessings of the covenant pass over to them, and remove the curse, so that those, who in themselves were unclean, are by grace consecrated to God, and brought under holy influences. Here it is true the baptism of infants is not mentioned, but the idea of their baptism and the authority for it are necessarily implied.¹ For if the children, in virtue of their birth from believing parents are already included in the covenant of grace, why should they be shut out from the sacrament, which impresses upon it the divine seal, and gives it, so to say, its proper validity ? It is true that the passage, together with the claim and the right to baptism, is limited to the children of such parents, as are, or

¹ This also Neander substantially admits when in speaking of the passage mentioned, he says Ap. H. I. fol. 282. “ From the point of view here presented by Paul, though it does testify (?) against the existence then of infant baptism, we find still the fundamental *idea*, from which infant baptism afterwards must and did develope itself, and by which it was to be justified in the spirit of Paul : the acknowledgment of the preference that could be given to children born in a Christian communion, in allowing them by baptism to be consecrated to the kingdom of God, and thereby, from their first development, to spread abroad an immediate sanctifying influence.”

at least one of them, believing, inasmuch as it is only in connexion with a Christian family life, that this *διδασκειν*, which, according to the command of Christ, is to follow baptism, and with it the maintenance and evolution of baptismal grace, can be expected to result in a substantial and confirmed life of faith.

If then the admissibility and propriety of infant baptism are grounded in the need which all have of salvation, in the very idea of primitive Christianity, in the extent and compass of the covenant of grace, in its analogy to circumcision, and in the organic, spiritual and bodily relation which believing parents sustain to their offspring; so may we suppose it extremely probable that its introduction would correspond with the first independent existence of a Christian congregation, and we have under such presumption every reason to believe that it was actually practised, when we read in the N. T. more than once, of the baptism of whole families, without any restriction whatever, (as we would have to expect, according to the Baptist theory); such for instance, as the household of Lydia, and the Jailer of Philippi, and Stephanas of Corinth; which are mentioned particularly as examples, though doubtless there were many similar cases, and it would be remarkable and contrary to daily experience, to take for granted that all these families were without children.

It is true that it has been attempted to set aside this exegetical result, by the testimony of a single witness, the well known polemic, *Tertullian*, who lived toward the close of the 2nd century, and from it to show that it had a proportionably later introduction. But this polemic himself most conclusively shows, that infant baptism did exist in his day, and with it the institution of sponsors. What is still more, *Tertullian* knew that the whole church *praxis* was against him, and he stood forth as a reformer in opposition to it. Had he referred to antiquity, and could he have spoken against infant baptism as an innovation, something new, he would doubtless have availed himself of this advantage. But he only calls in question, not its apostolic origin, not its admissibility, or propriety, but only its *expediency*. He considered it dangerous, inasmuch as according to his Montanistic view, an individual committing a mortal sin after baptism, must be shut out from church communion, and in all probability would be lost. Upon this ground, he advised that, not only infants, but also *grown* persons, who were not yet married, and had not taken upon themselves the vow of chastity, should put off their baptism, until they were fully secured

against the temptation to licentiousness.' This whole controversy of Tertullian rests—which Neander, Gieseler, and others appear not to have noticed, or at least have not brought forward—upon mistaken impressions, in which the church did not participate, and has nothing more than the force of an *isolated private judgment* in opposition to the prevailing theory and practice, and proves clearly the very reverse of that which it has often been attempted to show. Just so much may we with tolerable safety infer from it, that infant baptism, at that time, was not yet authoritatively established, but was left pretty much to the free will and judgement of Christian parents. Otherwise, Tertullian would scarcely have assailed it, so vigorously. As, however, in this particular, the spirit of the age was against him, his opposition, which by the way, was also in contradiction to some of his own principles, produced not the slightest effect, and died away without an echo.

This was made perfectly evident in the following century. The African church itself, in a council at Carthage in the year 246, decreed that it was not necessary even to defer baptism to the eighth day, as was the case in circumcision, but that it might be performed (not must) on the second, or third day, after birth; and CYPRIAN who had the greatest veneration for his preceptor Tertullian maintained this view. So entirely at that time already was every trace of the controversy against infant baptism obliterated, that the only question concerning it at issue was, whether according to Jewish analogy, they must delay it for at least eight days! At the very same time, ORIGEN of Alexandria, the most learned representative of the Greek church, who was himself baptized soon after his birth (an. 185), and at the death of Tertullian was 35 years old, speaks in the most unequivocal terms of infant baptism as an apostolic tradition, and a general church observance. If however from the silence of the church historians previous to Tertullian in relation to in-

'Non minore de causa, he says *innupti quoque procrastinandi*, in quibus tentatio praeputata est tam virginibus per maturitatem, quam viduis per vacationem, donec aut nubant, aut continentiae corroborentur. Consequently, according to Tertullian, baptism would have to be confined to superannuated and married persons, and monks and nuns! and yet he maintains on the other hand, that we can only be saved through the water of baptism, *nec aliter quam in aqua permanendo salvi sumus*. The wide difference between the standpoint of Tertullian and that of the Baptists, in the whole controversy, must be evident to any one possessed of any historical or critical skill. It is therefore perfectly absurd for the Baptists to refer as they do, with so much zeal, to the African church father.

fant baptism, we are to draw a conclusion against its practice, we should not forget, first, that we have altogether very few written memorials of those times, and that there are many other points also in regard to which we are entirely in the dark ; and then in the great missionary zeal of the age, and the rapid extension of the church, proselyte baptism would be most prominent, and in the nature of the case, would attract most attention. Still however there are not wanting, in the writings of CLEMENT of Alexandria, IRENAEUS and JUSTIN MARTYR, indications that show more or less clearly the existence of infant baptism. Especially is the passage, already cited from Irenæus, of the regeneration and sanctification of the period of childhood, by the childhood of Jesus, taken in connexion with his decided churchly habit of thought, and his close union of regeneration and baptism, a proof not only for the idea, but for the actual practice of infant baptism in his day. From this church Father, we may conclude back with great safety to his venerated preceptor POLYCARP, and he was the disciple and personal friend of ST. JOHN, the favorite apostle of Jesus Christ.

Translated by

Baltimore, Md.

B. C. W.

A DEVOUT MINISTRY.

JESUS Christ prayed, although he united in His person the attributes of the true Godhead and of perfect humanity. Prayer was his joy. Hours at a time he spent in devotion, not only now and then or at long intervals, but regularly and frequently. Why was this? Christ was perfectly holy. Could He not have exemplified the virtues of a perfect religion without the aid of prayer? In Him were hid all the treasures of infinite wisdom. Could He not have taught the plan of redemption and revealed the destiny of the world, without seeking additional knowledge in prayer? He had all power and authority in Heaven and on earth. Could He not have performed miracles, made a sufficient oblation for the sins of men and have risen from the grave, triumphing over the power of death and hell, without receiving new strength by holding formal, outward communion with God?

With Him prayer was not a matter of mere choice—not something which he could omit or perform with equal propriety. Nor did he pray because compelled to do so by the circumstances of Providence, or any power extraneous to himself. But He was impelled to prayer by an inward necessity—by the constitution of his person; not because he had committed sin or was liable to it and therefore required pardon or purification—nor because there was any deficiency in the resources of his divine-human nature for the purposes of his mission. He prayed just because He was very God and very man. The Son communes with the Father and the Father communes with the Son.

It belongs necessarily to the complete idea of an intelligent being that it thinks and utters its thoughts. Men think and speak through the medium of human language. Angels think and communicate their thoughts to each other, but of the manner in which this is done we know little or nothing. God thinks. The triune absolute Being, of whom angels and men are the reflection, communes with Himself under the highest form of perfection. The three self-existent and co-eternal persons, constituting in mysterious union the only true God, think simultaneously. To know and to think are identical. In other words, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, commune or hold fellowship with each other necessarily. Such communion belongs to the idea of their being and reciprocal relation, as demanded by sound philosophy and as revealed in the Scriptures. There are various passages, that clearly presuppose or indicate this fellow-

ship. There is one in the first chapter of Genesis: "And God said let us make man in our image, after our likeness,"¹ (v. 26). Another: "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool," (Ps. 110: 1). Others of similar import could be cited.

When the second Person of the glorious Godhead, the Word, "was made flesh and dwelt among us," the essential relation of the Son to the Father did not cease but of necessity continued to be the same; and their communion was therefore just as natural and necessary as it was before the incarnation. Under what form this communion subsisted before the incarnation human reason can not discover, nor has the Word of God attempted to explain it. But we know how it was conducted after the "Word was made flesh." The divine and human natures were mysteriously united in Christ. The Son lived on earth no less as man than as God. Though "in the bosom of the Father," He prayed on the mountains of Galilee, agonized in Gethsemane and expired on Golgotha. He had become a man, and communed with his Father through the medium of his human nature. That was prayer—the natural consequence of his relation to God as God.

Another reason is found in the relation of Christ to God as man. As a man, though sinless and pure, he was a dependent creature; and prayer or living communion with his Father in Heaven, was as becoming for Him as it is for any holy created being. Free from all selfishness, the spontaneous flow of His thoughts and feelings was directed towards God as the highest good. Conscious of his relation to his Father, and looking upon every part of creation as from God and for God, his manner of thinking referred every object of sense or spirit to Him. Alike from within and without he was thus prompted to hold uninterrupted intercourse with God; or rather, prayer was the free and proper exercise of all his powers as "a perfectly righteous man," from which his mind and heart could not but derive continual joy.

The human nature of Christ, however, was not in every sense of the term absolutely perfect. He was made *flesh*²—came in

¹ "Das groesste Werk seiner ewigen Liebe, die Erschaffung von Menschen, die er lieben, und die ihn erkennen und lieben koennen, ist daher ein Gegenstand der Berathung des Vaters und des Sohnes." Com. in loco, Otto von Gerlach.

² "Fleisch (John i: 13,) heisst allhie die gantze menschliche Natur, Leib und Seel sammt den wesentlichen Eigenschaften und Gebrechlichkeiten derselben, ausgenommen die Sünde."—Pal. Heid. Cat. Q. 35.

the likeness of sinful flesh—was made of a woman, made under the law to redeem them that are under the law, (Rom. viii : 3; Gal. iv : 4,); in other words, “the eternal Son of God, who is and continueth true and eternal God, took upon him the very nature of man, of the flesh and blood of the Virgin Mary, by the operation of the Holy Ghost; that he might also be the true seed¹ of David, like unto his brethren in all things, sin excepted.” Whenever the Evangelists or Apostles speak of Christ as a man, it is in a manner that accords with such a view of his human nature. Luke says: “And the child grew and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him,” (ii : 40). Again: “And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man” (v : 52). In the Epistle to the Hebrews it is said of him: “In the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared; though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him” (v : 7–9). These and similar portions of God’s Word, that exhibit the central relation of the person of Christ, viewed as divine and human, to the whole work of redemption, require us to believe: first, that Christ was in the full sense of the term, a man—that he was conceived and born, and that he grew; unfolding all his physical and intellectual powers according to the ordinary operation of the original laws of our common human nature; secondly, that being born of a virgin, possessing a fallen nature, and made under a law, violated by Adam and his posterity, his humanity inherited and was subject to all the evils of the curse, in as far as this was possible without himself being personally sinful or guilty. He was the second Adam, who, though he knew no sin, freely assumed and endured all the consequences of transgression as if he himself had violated the moral law, in order by his sanctifying life and vicarious death to overcome and destroy the power of sin and unite his people with himself in the possession of holiness and victory. Hence he could suffer hunger and thirst;

¹ “It behoved Him to be very man, descending from the same human nature which had sinned, and not created out of nothing, or let down from Heaven, but subject to all our infirmities, sin excepted.” “It was necessary therefore that He who would make satisfaction for man, should himself be very man, having sprung from the posterity of Adam which had sinned.” Williard’s Ursinus p. 35.

could be dependent, poor and sorrowful, be tempted and dejected, could groan in spirit, fear, weep and die.

Subjected of his own will to such a relation to a broken law, prayer was a means by which, under the trials and griefs incident to the flesh and his mission, Jesus Christ was strengthened and qualified for his arduous work. He prayed to his Father, and his Father heard his prayer. The Saviour of the world was a devout Saviour. "And it came to pass in those days that he went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God," (Luke vi: 12). He needed rest and sleep as really as other men do, but as the multitude, that thronged to see and hear him, did not permit him to retire for secret communion with his Father during the day, he devoted a whole night at a time to prayer in a mountain. He had no errors to acknowledge, no sins to confess, yet *he continued all night in prayer to God*. He needed not to beseech God for help to overcome indwelling corruption, not to plead for acceptance before the bar of absolute justice, yet *he continued all night in prayer to God*. He was never in any respect unfaithful to his solemn trust, nor was it possible for him ever to bring the slightest disgrace upon the holy name of Jehovah or upon the stupendous work of redemption, yet *he continued all night in prayer to God*. Here we find the true spirit of devotion. The principle is exemplified in the life of Him by whom it was inculcated: "Men ought always to pray, and not to faint."

"If any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of His," (Rom. viii: 9). The Apostle Paul furnishes a true and sufficient test of every man's spiritual condition. No layman follows Christ, or has a good hope of peace and life in Him, who does not possess and exhibit Christ's spirit. Much less can His commissioned ambassadors be said to be the proper exponents of His religion unless they have drunk in, continue to drink and live in Christ's spirit. They are called of God to minister at the altar as was Aaron. They profess to be filled with the knowledge of his will, in all wisdom and spiritual understanding. Enlightened by the Holy Ghost and renewed, they have been set apart, by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, to be, in one sense, the successors of Jesus Christ. They are those, therefore, through whom the enthroned babe of the manger, the exalted Lamb of Calvary, continues to carry forward in a fallen world the glorious work of saving men from sin and hell. When they wave the sword of the Spirit, they wield divine power. When they apply the balm of Gilead, they cure the death-wounds of the old serpent. When they blow the

trumpet of the Gospel, the dead are quickened and come forth from the graves of sin. By them and through them it is the immutable purpose of our victorious Lord to bring many sons unto glory.

All this implies, indeed, a divine call, divine authority and the possession of a power, not of merely human origin, but proceeding from God—a divine power that, accompanying the faithful ministrations of ministers in the pulpit and at the altar, operates through them upon man for life or for death; for they are “unto God a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish: to the one the savor of death unto death; and to the other, the savor of life unto life.” Yet it implies, too, the necessity of having an “unction from the Holy One,” the necessity of living “fellowship with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ.” Habitual prayer is the natural result of the peculiar relation established by the faith of the individual on the one hand, and by the ordination conferred by the church, on the other; and is at the same time an absolute condition, on which the full realization of what the relation imports always depends. If, to perform the sublime and momentous work of the ministry, the authority and power of Jesus Christ are necessary, certainly the Spirit by which He was always actuated is also altogether indispensable. Indeed, a man can not be said properly to avail himself of the authority and power of the office with which he is invested, unless he has imbibed the spirit of his Lord and Master. That spirit was eminently a spirit of devotion. He who, under one aspect, seems to have needed the benefit of prayer less than any man that ever did live or may live, prayed oftener, prayed more fervently, wrestled in prayer in greater agony, than did any Prophet or Apostle. His spirit is indeed a spirit of wisdom, a spirit of love, a spirit of burning zeal, but just as truly is it a spirit of secret communion with God. And are men who are called to preach Christ and Him crucified, in a certain sense, His successors in office? Then, if a distinction be allowable, it may be said that in regard to this particular—His habit of devotion—they should be more like their great Exemplar, than in regard to any other. For all scientific attainments, all pulpit and pastoral labors, all personal influence, to be efficient for good, must be moulded by union and communion with Him.

A devout mind is intimately connected with progress in knowledge and preparation for the pulpit. The system of truth revealed in the Bible is not only divine, but derives its peculiar value from its relation to the person and work of Christ, as its proper

life. He is the point of observation from which men must study the different parts of the whole plan of redemption, in order rightly to understand its excellence and admire its beauty. To know, therefore, what may be known, and to acquire more and more of the unmeasured wealth of the Bible, it is necessary first of all to know Christ—not only to know something of Him by searching the Scriptures and studying the best productions of scientific and heavenly minded men, but also to know Him himself. The ambassadors of Christ must sit at the feet of Christ and hear His words. He is *the Life*, which they must possess as the branch possesses the life of the vine, and unfold in themselves by growing in Him as the branch grows in the vine. As the existence of spiritual life depends upon their vital union with Him through faith, so do their knowledge, growth and fruitfulness depend upon constant communion—upon the habit of devotion as directed by the written Word. For they can understand Christ only in as far as they possess Him. Only when they try for themselves to sound the ocean of his fulness of grace and truth, can they think rationally and speak intelligently of its unfathomable depths. Living communion with Christ brings the power of his mediation to bear directly upon the remaining corruptions of our fallen nature, and thus removes the great hindrances in the way of a clear apprehension and a proper appreciation of the manifold truths of the Scriptures. The mind and heart are elevated above the sphere of sense and sin, and qualified to look upon a fallen world and a redeemed church in the light of the cross—qualified to look upon wicked man, upon error and the prevalence of vice, upon sorrow, sickness and death, upon judgment, Heaven and hell, with the eyes of Jesus—qualified, to some extent, to perceive the connection, the depth, the force, the beauty and riches of God's word, with the mind of Jesus—qualified to expose sin, to set forth free grace, to persuade men to become reconciled to God, and to weep over erring and afflicted Jerusalem, with the soul of Jesus. Then can the ambassadors of Christ progress in divine knowledge, when, by communion with Him, He draws in a living way the outlines of his own image on their hearts. Then can they set forth the excellence and glory of the Christian religion, when, like polished mirrors, they reflect the rays proceeding from the Sun of Righteousness upon the world.

A devout mind is intimately connected with the actual preaching of the Gospel. "And it came to pass when Moses came down from Mount Sinai with the two tables of testimony in ~~his~~ hand, when he came down from the Mount, that Moses

wist not that the skin of his face shone while he talked with them. And when Aaron and all the children of Israel saw Moses, behold, the skin of his face shone; and they were afraid to come nigh," (Ex. xxxix : 29, 30). There was something in the appearance and manner of Moses when he came down from Sinai, that was extraordinary, and unaccountable to Aaron and the children of Israel. He bore visible marks of his having had a personal interview with God.

Devotion serves to assimilate the whole man to Christ. The body of Moses was so affected by the miraculous light that attended the presence of Jehovah on Sinai, as to reflect its visible glory when he stood before the people; in like manner is the soul of the believer, who maintains intimate communion with Christ, affected and transformed by the Spirit into His likeness. His whole being is elevated and attended by a heavenly influence. Through it Christ makes himself felt. He gives dignity and solemnity, warmth and earnestness to the preaching of the Gospel. There is consequently that in the manner of devout ministers which comports with the sacredness of the pulpit, the infinite importance of vital godliness, and the nearness and truth of eternal things. They speak as moved by a sense of Christ's authority. They speak as pervaded by a sense of Christ's sustaining power. They speak as in God's presence.

A devout mind is intimately connected with a man's bearing and manner of life. As the blood flows from the heart to the extremities of our physical frame, animating every member of the body, so the religion of Jesus Christ is designed not only to mould every faculty of the soul but also to control, as a consequence, all our feelings, plans and actions, in any sphere and in all the relations of life. "True religion will show its influence in every part of your conduct; it is like the sap of a living tree which penetrates the most distant boughs." It is important that Christianity produce its legitimate effects in all believers. But it is more important still that those who convey the messages of God to the church and the world, should possess and exhibit the mind of Christ. How shall this end be gained? "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit." Sin and the world ever seek to assert their claims and hold dominion. Paul replies: "I say then, walk in the Spirit and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh," (Gal. v : 16). The branch resists the adverse influences of storms, and excessive cold or heat, in virtue of its vital connection with the vine. And there is but one way to overcome any internal as well as external hindrances to holiness and heavenly-mindedness, and clothe one's whole being with the mild

radiance of divine love, that will make the purity and sweetness of grace felt by every susceptible mind : that is, unceasing communion with Christ by faith. It was once said of Christ by cunning officers that had been commissioned by the Pharisees and chief Priests to catch him in his words : " Never man *spoke* like this man," (John, vii : 46). But if those malicious men had followed him to the mountain and seen him at the silent hour of midnight on his knees, lost in his devotions, they could have added : " Never man *prayed* like this man." His devotion stood in most intimate connection with His teaching and the whole tenor of his life. They may understand the import of His instructions, who seek to cultivate a devout mind ; but none others. They will exhibit the image of Him who was " altogether lovely," and silently but constantly rebuke a gainsaying world for its impiety and unbelief. Laying hold of his powerful grace, and transformed into His likeness, they will bring forth the precious fruits of righteousness. They abide in Him, and He abides in them ; and their words will be holy words ; their influence, a holy influence. Their bearing will be Christ-like. And carnal men will be forced to see and feel, that the professed ambassadors of Jesus Christ are not of the world, but that He has chosen them out of the world, and ordained them, that they should go and bring forth fruit.

These brief considerations may serve to illustrate *the necessity of a devout ministry*. A logical discipline of the intellect, profound scholarship and general intelligence, are important. A knowledge of profane and ecclesiastical history and extensive as well as thorough theological attainments, are important. Elegant manners, a good address and general tact, are important. But one thing is more important than any one of these qualifications or than all of them put together : it is *a devout heart*. A devout heart, indeed, does not of itself constitute fitness for the ministry of reconciliation, in the absence of other essential qualifications. Yet it is the condition of complete biblical scholarship. When other necessary attainments are not wanting, it discovers, and places the student of the Scriptures in possession not only theoretically but really of the true principle of biblical interpretation. " In thy light shall we see light." A devout heart becomes thus a necessary condition of success and joy in the great work of turning " many to righteousness." Knowledge is, indeed, called power ; and such it is ; but knowledge, apart from Christ, who alone is " the resurrection and the life," is not able to break the fetters of spiritual death. Eloquence may agitate the minds of men until they cast forth mire and

dirt, but it can as little purify them as can the sound of a cymbal. Good conversational powers, polite manners and general sociability, may win the affections of the people and secure for a minister of the Gospel a certain sort of popularity, but these accomplishments can not turn a soul from sin or the world to Christ. A devout heart holds all natural abilities, all scientific and theological attainments, all external accomplishments, in conscious connection with the human-divine life of our blessed Lord. Held in this relation every faculty and acquisition contributes to the extension and honor of the church. Engrafted into Him by a living faith, the sap of Christ's life circulates through all the branches of a man's being, and, although they expand on earth where the climate of sin hinders their growth and mars their beauty, yet it clothes them with the evergreen foliage and blushing fruit of the heavenly Canaan.

Tiffin, O.

E. V. G.

BOOK NOTICES.

It will be seen that we make no regular business of noticing new books ; though in conformity with the reigning fashion of our Reviews, we refuse not to allow mention occasionally of some which are politely thrown in our way. We do not look upon it as a necessary feature at all of a publication "devoted to theology, literature and science," that it should pretend to keep pace in this manner with what is called the current literature of the day. On the contrary, we question seriously if any such pretension, as the world now moves, can be maintained consistently at all with a true devotion to the great interests we have just named. Something of the sort might have been feasible possibly, when this fashion of book noticing first came into vogue. But the case has grown latterly into quite another form, and threatens to become still worse and more unmanageable in time to come. Our current literature has become a burden. We are fairly flooded with pamphlets and books. And then, as all sensible people know, it is to a great extent a deluge of trash. In these circumstances, if the stereotyped fashion of short notices is to be kept up, it must be in one of two ways. Either the reviewer must take upon him the laborious task of winnowing the wheat from its mountains of chaff—a work not likely, if done with any effect, to prove very satisfactory to the "trade;" or else he must make up his mind heroically to notice in off-hand matter-of-course style all sorts of publications, without caring whether they be wheat or chaff. The task undertaken in the first form, is of itself enough for a special editorship and journal; and to some such charge, under proper auspices, must it be consigned in form, if it is ever to be of any valuable account. No such Augean labor should be assumed by any Review, which proposes to fill another department of its own in a positive and living way; or at least, it should be put upon the shoulders of a separate editor, of right size and frame for the Herculean work. It is most commonly however in the other style, that the *literary* task in consideration is attempted by our periodical tribunals; and then the consequences are still more sorrowful and sad. Who has not come to be heartily sick and tired of the ordinary run of such notices, as we meet them now continually in our city papers, and fantastical empty brained city magazines? With very few exceptions, they are worth absolutely nothing. That indeed is only what might be expected. No thought of literature or science enters into the transaction. It is all for capital and trade. The advertisement is of one sort

with the ware. It is, to a truly dreadful extent, trash all round. But our religious newspapers—*they* surely will have some regard here to principle and conscience? Alas, the man who surrenders himself to their guidance will be little better off at last, than the sentimental miss who takes in literature from the hot pressed pages of Godey or Sartain. The weekly bulletin, is in most cases perfectly unmeaning and blind—made up of indiscriminating generalities, vague guesses, catches of opinion borrowed from other quarters, with touches of bigotry and prejudice ever at hand to suit as occasion may offer the latitude of some particular party or sect. Most unprofitable altogether and lackadaisically insipid! With our Reviews, the fashion ought to proceed somewhat more respectably; and we are willing to believe charitably that this is in some measure the case. But the charity cannot be allowed to reach very far. If we are not much mistaken, the omnibus birds-eye view of new publications, or what affects to pass itself off for this, in most of our religious Quarterlies, is growing to be in the estimation of judicious readers a good deal of an irksome bore and sham. It is but too plain, that the thing is for the most part “done to order,” in loose haphazard style, without knowledge or inward earnestness, for mere parade and outside effect. It has run into mechanical humdrum, a sort of treadmill monotony, which we hold to be of no real account for the cause of literature whatever. This may explain our perfect indifference to the whole “feature,” in the case of our own Review. Those who wish impromptu judgments of this sort, stirrup opinions as the Germans phrase it, superficial wholesale squibs and puffs, on all sorts of books, read or not read, must betake themselves for this purpose to some other quarter. That is no part of *our* mission or plan. Most of this literature of the day happily never comes in our way—one blest advantage of our secluded village life. We know of it only by the hearing of the ear. This we feel to be commonly quite enough. We would not have it for our library, in any wholesale form, not even as a free gift. Much less would we have it, on the condition of wading through only a small part of it to prove its worth. We have no heart for California mud washings in search of uncertain gold—with the strong possibility of reaching nothing *but* mud when the process is done. Least of all would we pay for any such stuff the heavy price, of being ready always to say a good word in its favor. We do not pretend to carry on business in this line. We have no time for it, and it is something not at all to our talent or taste.

UNCLE TOM'S CABIN; or *Life among the Lowly*. By HARRIET BEECHER STOWE. Boston and Cleaveland: Jewett & Co. 2 vols. 12 mo. pp. 634.

THE writer of fiction may have two objects in view: first, to produce a story which shall carry with it attraction and power as a work of art; second, to inculcate certain principles or doctrines. The first is accomplished by working up the materials which lie, in fancy or fact, at the bottom of the story into a life-like and attractive form. This requires thorough knowledge of human nature, great skill in the grouping of facts and incidents, and the power of easy narrative and vivid portrayal. The second object is accomplished by giving such a tinge to the narration of events or the portrayal of character, as will steadily and almost irresistibly lead the mind of the reader to the point of view desired by the writer; or by direct reflections of a moral or practical character upon facts related; or by certain expressive soliloquizings upon a denouement which has been effected. Of the book before us we may say that the authoress has attained the former of these objects, and evidently aims at the latter. That slavery as it exists in our country, by the diversity of treatment afforded to the slave, and the consequent attachments and aversions formed; by its development of reckless character in the person of the slave trader; by its merciless sundering of families and old ties; its attendant mixture of races, by which singular and gifted characters are often developed; its thrilling flights and bloody captures; furnishes the materials for a dramatic story of a high order, cannot be doubted by one at all familiar with the pathos, romance and heroism involved. These elements Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe has studied thoroughly and *feelingly*; and has wrought them into the tale of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" with great artistic skill. Every part of the story seems to bear the touches of a hand, guided by an acute understanding of human nature,—and especially colored nature. Of its absorbing power we have had regretful experience when we ventured to sit down to it, with an engagement awaiting the next hour. Its great peculiarity is its *intensity*. It seems to be written under the pressure of deep emotion,—and written as a woman only could write. It carries you along whether your judgment assents or not. With regard to the teachings which the story is meant to carry, we cannot class them justly with those of the ultra abolitionists. The better side of slavery is exhibited in a strong light. Full account is made of the legal difficulties under which conscientious slave owners labour.

Eminent types of Christian character are developed both in master—or rather mistress—and slave. We observed nothing of the “Down with the government,” “Down with the church,” spirit. Nevertheless there is an uncompromising war waged with the *system* of slavery itself, and the late fugitive slave bill; and odium cast upon all their apologists. There is the frequent verdict of the emotions without consulting the judgment, so natural in a woman; the frequent puzzling appeal *ad hominem*, a species of sophistry so easy upon all great questions of the kind; and an occasional contemptuous fling at ministers and law-makers; which we are sorry to see, and which indicate a state of mind not exactly conservative. The influence of the book will be different upon different minds, according to the point of view. But if you wish to intersperse your reading with alternate laughing and weeping; if you wish to rise spent, and with a headache, to find that hours have sped unconsciously as you turned its pages; and if you wish to study some of the most lovely types of Christian character which fiction has ever drawn; we advise you to take a peep into “Uncle Tom’s Cabin.”

Chambersburg, Pa.

C.

GOD IN DISEASE; or *the manifestations of Design in Morbid Phenomena*. By JAMES F. DUNCAN, M. D. *Physician to Sir P. Dun’s Hospital, Dublin*. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1852 12mo. pp. 232.

HERE is a new field for the display of the *a posteriori* argument for the existence and attributes of God; a field which has been neglected, the author tells us, because the writers upon natural theology of the school of Paley and Chalmers have all been unmedical men. The object of the present treatise is to pursue, in the region of morbid phenomena, the same line of investigation which other writers of the same class, have pursued in other spheres of cause and effect; and we see not why the argument should be less legitimate in the one case than in the other. That morbid phenomena pursue their course, in obedience to fixed laws, with as much regularity as the planets move in their orbits, or the moon changes her disc, or the seasons their hue and products; that they have their periods of invasion, of maturation and decline, and that their progress is capable of being ascertained approximately, and made the subject of calculation, the author not only assumes, but is assumed

by every system of medicine ; and that all this, together with the phenomena exhibited by the varieties and modifications of disease, the uses and alleviations of pain, the processes of preservation, reparation and adaptation in disease, and the manifold symptoms by which it is preceded and known ; argues the existence of an intelligent cause, we think as legitimate as any other argument *a posteriori* ; besides possessing the merit of being unusual. With regard to the origin and design of disease, the author clearly connects the former with the introduction of sin into the world, and makes to depend in the particular case upon the providence of God : and he resolves the latter into correction and discipline, designed to promote the spiritual welfare, rather than into punishment simply. An argument for the benevolence of God is thus framed from what has often been regarded as very unpromising material. A truly Christian spirit breathes upon every page, and the book is sufficiently free from technical terms to be available to the general reader. The author is a physician, whose profession has evidently been turned to his spiritual benefit. C.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF LIVING. By HERBERT MAYO, M. D.
Formerly senior surgeon to the Middlesex hospital, &c.
From the third London edition. Philadelphia : Lindsay &
Blakiston. 1852. 12mo. pp. 272.

It is characteristic of the latter ages of the world, that Philosophy has become less etherial than ancient sages dreamed of or desired ; or at least is not so jealous of her name. She has deigned, from her pleroma of abstractions, to turn her eye upon every thing that pertains to the interests of man, and to put her autograph to columns of statistics and pages of detail. "The Philosophy of Living," as presented by Dr. Mayo, is the philosophy of the outer man ; which cannot be deemed unimportant when we appreciate the vital relation holding between the outer man and the inner. The subjects discussed are, Diversities of Constitution ; Diet ; Exercise ; Sleep ; Bathing ; Clothing ; Air and Climate ; and Health of Mind. Many valuable hints are thrown out, and much useful information presented,—the result of experience and careful observation,—which would accomplish a vast amount of good if brought within the perusal of all. But we must be permitted to say that we are ever learning new illustrations of the adage, that "Doctors will differ."

After having the belief in virtues of the cold bath so zealously pressed into our creed, and being assured that the height of physical felicity was the extatic glow experienced after jumping into bed from an ablution with water a few degrees above the freezing point, judge of our surprise on being told that at night warm water should be employed; and that to use cold water at night, though allowable in the morning, was a physiological error. We were chagrined to think that Dr. M. would have it, that our heroism in the persistent use of the freezing bath was all thrown away. C.

THE LIFE OF JUDGE JEFFREYS, *Chief Justice of the King's Bench under Charles II, and Lord High Chancellor of England during the reign of James II.* By HUMPHREY P. WOOLRYCH. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1852. 12mo. pp. 316.

SINCE the publication of Macaulay's History of England, Sir George Jeffreys has become well known, on this side of the water, as a prominent actor in tragic history. His reckless audacity in the absence of danger, and his cowardice in its presence; his inmedicable wickedness, and his craven superstition; his boisterous passions, his gleams of generosity, his talents and stupidities, have made him a character which would be thought overdrawn were it the product of the pen of the dramatist. His blustering zeal against non-conformists, his ridiculous assumptions of authority on the bench, his treatment of Richard Baxter, and Lady Lisle, have excited laughter and loathing in thousands of readers. Such a character, one should think, would have little claim to have his "Life" written. Yet he has found a biographer;—and we have here a biography designed, professedly, to bring to view the few redeeming traits, which it is possible to discover in so bad a character. This is done upon the supposition, that "it would be absurd to predicate of any person that he is entirely vicious," and that "the depraved and degenerate, will often in their mood, achieve generous and noble deeds." But it is evident on every page that the author finds the "Chief Justice of the King's Bench," a hard subject for the illustration of this truth. It strikes us that he finds a poor return for his labor of love. Here is the substance of it. "His bright, sterling talents must be acknowledged; that intuitive perception which led him to penetrate in a moment the thin-

veil of hypocrisy, and show things as they were, must have its meed. Like Thurlow, he had the especial gift of fastening on the true genius of the cause, eliciting its nice point, and forming a prompt decision on the right bases of equity and justice ;" to which must be added his, "admirable gay humour and eternal vivacity of wit." To our mind the shades of oblivion would have been the best veil for his faults, and the best guardian of his virtues. C.

THE LIFE OF LOUIS KOSSUTH, *Governor of Hungary, &c.*
By P. C. HEADLEY. Author of 'Life of Josephine,' 'Life of Lafayette,' &c. Auburn : Derby and Miller. 1852. 12 mo. pp. 461.

It was certainly to be expected that the great Magyar, who has lately filled so large a space in the world's eye, whose thrilling eloquence in behalf of down-trodden humanity has acted so spasmodically upon the masses which he has addressed, and who has left his name indelibly impressed, it is thought, upon a new style of hat, would speedily find a biographer. It is worthy of note that in less than six months after his arrival upon our shores, his life is written, in a volume bulkier than the Pilgrim's Progress, or the voyage to Lilliput, printed, and scattered all over the country. Of course the present book is written *con amore*. No one actuated by a different spirit would choose to be the biographer of Louis Kossuth. He constantly towers before you as the great Apostle of Liberty, and expounder of the rights of man ; and an estimate is made of "his mission," which had better have been reserved for future ages. A most remarkable man he certainly is : honest, gifted and eloquent ; and whatever he may do for the future or the future do for him, his Life and especially his Speeches, may be read with interest and profit. The book contains an introduction by Horace Greely, and an Appendix containing his prominent speeches in England and the United States. C.

ROMANISM AT HOME. *Letters to the Hon. ROGER B. TANEY, Chief Justice of the United States.* By KIRWAN. New-York : Harper & Brothers. 1852. 12mo. pp. 272.

KIRWAN is well known as the author of Letters to Bishop

Hughes on the doctrines and teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. The present letters are upon the "external arrangements" of the same church: "its government, its despotism, its spirit, its legends, its relics, and its influence on the moral, social and political interests of the world;" and are addressed to chief Justice Taney, the most prominent layman nominally in that communion, because the author wishes to appeal from the Roman priests to the people. For the purpose of gathering material for these letters, "Kirwan" made a flying visit to Rome during the last year, that he might see Romanism in its ancient home of the "seven hilled city." They are characterised by the sprightliness and wit of the former series; and are even more peculiarly illustrative of what this Journal has formerly denominated "the reigning mode of attack" upon the church of Rome. Those to whose taste this mode of attack is congenial will read these letters with interest. C.

THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY; *in their external, or historical division*; a course of Lectures. By CHARLES PETTIT McILVAINE. *Bishop of Ohio*. Philadelphia: Daniels & Smith. 1852. 12mo. pp. 408.

THESE Lectures traverse the usual field of the external evidences of the Religion of Christ; viz: the authenticity and genuineness of the New Testament; the credibility of the Gospel history; miracles; prophecy; propagation and fruits of Christianity; inspiration; and answers to objections. The author, however, has chosen his own path over this wide field; and he conducts the reader along pleasantly and instructively. The form of the Lectures is popular, and the style fresh and forcible, and on every page breathes the kindly and candid spirit of the excellent Bishop of Ohio. The book is fitted to do good; and, we are told by the author, has to his personal knowledge been instrumental in leading many minds from the confines of infidelity to the knowledge of "the truth as it is in Jesus." C.

MEMOIRS OF MARGARET FULLER OSSOLI. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1852. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 704.

A very remarkable book, radiant with the glow of intellect,

and studded with the gems of literature and beauty ;—memoirs of a very remarkable, and to our mind not very loveable woman, who was lost in the wreck of the Elizabeth, on the sandbars of Long Island Sound in the Summer of 1850. The pens engaged in its compilation, are those of James F. Clarke, Wm. H. Channing, and Ralph Waldo Emerson.. Of course it must be expected to savour somewhat of transcendentalism and negation. The mind of Margaret Fuller was prone to aberration and unrest ; and this a certain class of gifted modern thinkers seem to regard as essential to earnestness. Errant genius, and especially errant religious genius, is an object of worship with the modern religionists, whose motto is, "Adieu O Church."

Chambersburg, Pa.

C.

The above books are to be had, at city retail prices, at the Book-store of Shryock & Reed, Chambersburg, Pa.

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

SEPTEMBER, 1852.

VOL. IV.—NO. V.

CYPRIAN.

Third Article.

CYPRIAN'S doctrine of the CHURCH we have found to be fundamental to his whole theology and religious life. In proportion as this is the case, it becomes important to understand well in what relation it stood to the faith and life of the Christian world generally in the first ages. To do justice to the man, as well as to judge properly of the doctrine, we must inquire how far this was peculiar to himself and to the time when he lived; or is to be regarded as having come down by legitimate inheritance and tradition from a still older period, as part of the faith which was supposed to have been originally delivered to the saints. To feel the full significance of such an inquiry, we need only to bring to mind distinctly the leading features of the Cyprianic doctrine of the church, and to observe at the same time the broad contrast and contradiction in which they may be seen at once to stand, with the thinking of a large portion of the modern so called evangelical world on the same subject.

What is most necessary to be kept in view in the Cyprianic

doctrine, is not this or that feature of it taken in a separate abstract light, the point of episcopacy for instance or the point of baptismal regeneration, but the universal idea rather, the conception of the church as a whole, out of which all such particular features flow, and in the presence and power of which alone they can be said to have any real force. The Campbellite Baptists, in their style, run away with the notion of an objective power of some sort belonging to the sacrament of baptism; and then claim to be what the church was in the beginning, by laying all stress on the ordinance in such view, as was done in primitive times. Their theory is, that the sacrament, as a Divine appointment, may be torn away from the living constitution to which it originally appertained, without losing its force, and so that the use of it by any class of men professing to obey the Gospel may be taken as sufficiently valid at all times for its original purposes and ends. The pedantry is much the same, it seems to us, when Episcopalians run away in similar style with mere episcopacy, or with the notion of a liturgy; and on the ground of such distinction simply pretend to be in union here with what the Church was in the first ages, with a certain affectation of exclusive completeness over against all other Protestant bodies which happen not to be possessed of the same advantage. What charm is there, we ask again as we have asked before, in a ministry of bishops, that it should be considered sufficient to bear away with it, wherever found, the original powers and prerogatives of the church, without regard to the whole constitution of the church as it stood in the beginning? Or what talismanic virtue for any such end shall be supposed to reside in the use of a liturgy, kept up in the same isolated way? We grant at once the argument for episcopacy drawn from the practice of the church in the third century; as we allow also the full force of the argument in the same form for the use of liturgies. Nothing short of the most bull-necked obstinacy, can refuse to see and admit what is so perfectly clear. In these points, separately viewed, Episcopalians undoubtedly come nearer to the Christianity of Cyprian's time, than the bodies they affect to exclude and condemn. We may say as much however of the Gospel according to Alexander Campbell. It approaches the primitive scheme of Christianity here and there, more closely than most of the sects which agree in denouncing it as rationalistic and false. And yet rightly no such advantage in this case, is allowed to be of any account; just because the resemblances rested upon show themselves to be not living but dead, are not rooted in the presence of the same life, but owe their

appearance altogether to outward artificial imitation. Mechanical similitude in this way is something widely different from organical communion. It is quite possible to conceive of an identity of life under great variations of outward form, while it may be wanting entirely where the outward show of variation is the least. No figure in wax can stand truly for the life it represents. No parts brought outwardly together can constitute a living whole. So in the case before us, we say, Episcopalians are quite too fast, when from the single fact of their agreement with the primitive church in the matter of episcopacy, and one or two other like separate points, they at once jump to the conclusion that they alone have preserved under a Protestant form the true succession of what Christianity was in the beginning, and that all other Protestant bodies are without authority and right. This, we are fully persuaded, is to bring the whole cause of Protestantism into peril. The question between those who receive and those who reject episcopacy on Protestant ground is a mere circumstance, over against the broad deep issue by which in the nature of the case both are sundered from the Church of Rome; and as related to this, it is a mere circumstance in the problem of making out for Protestantism a real historical derivation from the Christianity of the first ages. For one who is brought to understand the actual state of the case, it is easy enough to see that if Episcopalian Protestantism can be successfully justified in its measure of variation from the old order of the church, Protestantism without episcopacy also may be justified in the like general predicament; the difference in the degree of variation in the two cases being after all nearly as nothing, in comparison with what is of common amount. The grand question regards the right of Protestantism in its whole view. Has it been possible at all to maintain a true succession of the ancient church life, under this form? Let us feel only that an intelligent affirmative answer can be returned to this question, and we shall feel at the same time that the possibility cannot be held reasonably to the narrow limits of the Anglican scheme. To be of any real force that far, it must be of force still farther. By seeking to fix it within any such purely arbitrary and mechanical bounds, we in fact destroy it altogether.

The Cyprianic doctrine of the church made vast account indeed of episcopacy; but not of episcopacy in any and every view. The significance of the whole institution was conditioned by the universal scheme to which it belonged. It was felt to be of fundamental account in its organic relation to this scheme; while out of such connection it was held to be of no importance

whatever. What we need then to understand and keep in view, as we have said, is the conception or idea as a whole, which the doctrine before us exhibits as the true theory of the church. With regard to this, there is no room for any serious mistake. We may call in question, if we please, the truth of the theory. We may say that Cyprian and his age were in error. But the fact of the theory itself is too plain to be made the subject of any dispute, so far at least as its general form is concerned.

The theory is, that the Church was literally a Divine constitution, built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; that it grew out of the mystery of the Incarnation, and had its perpetual charter in the living power of the Apostolical Commission; that it bore thus the character of a true historical organization in the bosom of the world's present life; that under such outwardly visible and historical form, it carried in itself at the same time real heavenly and supernatural powers, actual virtue and force above nature for its own more than earthly and natural ends; that the exercise of these powers was through functions and organs ordained of God, and centering in the ministry of the episcopate, which was derived by clear succession from the office of the Apostles, and in the character of a solid corporation formed at once the basis and the bond of unity for the universal organism; and that there was no room consequently to think of salvation, except in the bosom of this most real system and through its instrumental mediation and help. It is easy to see, in such view, that all faith must start as an act of submission on the part of men to the authority with which they were supposed to be thus objectively confronted. Where a real constitution of this sort was allowed to be at hand, it is plain that no acknowledgment of Christianity could be regarded as true and valid, that fell short of an actual bowing of the soul to its claims in this form. Only to question these claims, to make them a matter for debate, was to refuse for the time the objective reality to which by Divine right they were taken to appertain. To talk of faith on the outside of the church was at once a contradiction in terms. No faith could be honest and sound, which was not ready to submit to the mystery which here challenged its submission. To believe, was of necessity thus to be also *baptized*, or in other words to come under the power in this real way of that real supernatural system, into the bosom of which baptism was considered always to be the solemn act of introduction, the sacrament of a new birth. And then we need be at no loss to understand the vast stress which was laid on the sin of schism.

With this theory of the church, it becomes at once an offence in full parallel with heresy, simply the obverse side in truth of that sin. It rests necessarily on the assumption, that there is no Holy Catholic Church, in the sense now under consideration—no real objective constitution, embodying in itself by Divine ordination the mystery of the Christian salvation under a supernatural form, and carrying in itself in such view the full guaranty of its proper infallible sufficiency for its own ends—and that Christianity therefore is by no means bound to any such order and method of revelation in the world, but may be carried into effect and made of force for the purposes of salvation, by the mere judgment and will of men, in some other form altogether. But who may not see, that for the doctrine before us every assumption of this sort, however tacitly and silently made, must be at once the negation of the whole fact of Christianity, the opposite exactly of all true faith? It strikes at the root of the whole mystery, which faith is required here to embrace; and in the bosom of which only as a Divine reality it can have any power to save. Schism then, in the very nature of the case, must be wholesale heresy also and death. It is the most fundamental of all forms of insurrection against the authority of the Gospel. It aims at its universal subversion.

Such, we say, is the Cyprianic doctrine of the church. Our modern Protestant scheme, it is painfully evident, is altogether different. The difference does not turn by any means on the question of episcopacy, or on any such point as purgatory, transubstantiation, or the worship of the saints. It lies deeper than all this. The true last ground of it opens upon us in the doctrine of the church. Protestantism, it is plain, involves an entire departure from the theory or scheme of Cyprian here, not simply as it may reject this or that form of ecclesiastical polity, this or that ecclesiastical usage, but as it refuses to see in the church the actual presence of the Christian salvation under the same outwardly real and objective view. Let no one take offence at this, as though it were a reproach cast upon Protestantism. We have to do with it at present only as a simple fact of history. As such, we are bound to see it, to acknowledge it, to make it the subject of earnest and solemn consideration. It is a fact which needs to be understood and satisfactorily explained, to make good our common boast that Protestantism seeks only the light.

So far as Puritanism is concerned, the difference now mentioned is immediately palpable. It openly repudiates the whole idea of the church, which is exhibited to us by Cyprian, con-

siders it a figment, part indeed of the mystery of iniquity, and something diametrically opposed to the notion of evangelical piety after its own approved style. It never grows tired of harping on the string, that to trust in the church is to have no proper sense of the spirituality of the Gospel, and that a religion of sacraments is puerile and unsafe. It sets Christianity on the outside of the church. This is not of the essence and constitution of the awful mystery in any way, but only an outward accident attached to it, which men may order and shape as they best can, with help of the Bible, to suit their own taste. The church is not the medium of the Christian salvation in any real sense. Faith stands not primarily in any act of submission to it in any such view; but has regard to truth under an altogether different form, and may be complete under a character of most perfect abstraction from its claims, and indeed must be so to make the acknowledgment of these claims afterwards, such as they are, of any actual account. Schism, on this scheme, becomes a very venial offence, is no longer at all intelligible indeed in its ancient sense. The universal sect system is based, of course, on the absolute want of everything like faith in the article of the Holy Catholic Church as it once stood; and the tendency of this system always is towards its own natural end of full Baptist Independentism, which boldly resolves the whole mystery into the notion of an indefinite multitude of churches formed by "social contract," in Jean Jacques Rousseau style, without the remotest imagination of any supernatural right or force whatever.

But the Puritan system in this case is not alone. The difference before us extends also, as already intimated, to Anglican Episcopalianism. Its theory of the church is not that of Cyprian. Whether right or wrong, this last makes no room for the legitimate entrance of any such fact as the Reformation, owns no possibility whatever of a valid hierarchy aside from the unity of the apostolical succession as a solid whole, and asserts with unfaltering precision the presence of supernatural powers objectively at hand in the church and to be found nowhere else.

The difference is with Protestantism as a whole. It is not to be disguised, that this rests upon a doctrine of the church, which is broadly at variance with the doctrine of Cyprian. It becomes then a most interesting and momentous inquiry: *In what relation does this Cyprianic doctrine stand to the life and faith of the Christian world generally in the first ages?* The man who can be indifferent to the practical solemnity of this inquiry, may be very sure that he has himself no real faith in the Divine

realness of Christianity, but is mistaking for it always a hollow phantom only of his own brain.

May it be successfully pretended, in the first place, that Cyprian's doctrine was in any material view peculiar to himself, or that it gained ground and credit in the Christian world mainly through his authority and influence. This is a favorite fancy with some; and it receives a certain measure of countenance even from such a man as Neander. He talks of a gradual rise of hierarchical views by defection from the first simplicity of the Gospel, and sees in the schisms of Felicissimus and Novatian the last unsuccessful efforts of an older more free and spiritual tendency to maintain itself in opposition to this new movement, which was now bearing all in its own wrong direction. Cyprian, it is admitted, was not strictly the author of the movement; he found himself rather borne upon its bosom. But his personality fitted him to become beyond all other men of the time its representative and organ; and the supposition is accordingly, that it owed its triumph in the third century very largely to his active and uncompromising zeal. We have already seen however, to some extent, how little foundation there is for any hypothesis of this sort, in the actual facts of the age. The evidence is most ample and full, that Cyprian's doctrine of the church was, in all its essential features, the doctrine held in his time by the whole Christian world. East and West here were substantially of one and the same mind. Everywhere we find episcopacy, not only established, but acknowledged also to be of Divine right, by direct continuation down from the time of the Apostles. Along with this we find moreover, on all sides, the idea of the necessary unity of the church, the conception of its supernatural real constitution as an object of faith, in the sense of the Apostles' Creed, the acknowledgment of its essential relation to all true godliness, as being the body of Christ and so the medium through which he carries forward his glorious salvation in the world. Faith was held to stand primarily in this very habit of mind. It was obedience to the claims of the Christian fact, exhibited precisely in this outwardly objective and historical form. Hence baptism was owned to be regeneration; the eucharist was felt to involve the mystery of a real communication with the Saviour's flesh and blood; priestly absolution, following penance and confession, was relied upon as of true force for the remission of sin. Schism was regarded a deadly offence, just because it turned the fact of the Church into a lie, and was in this way a standing act of disobedience to the truth Divinely lodged in her constitution. We may set all

this down, if we see proper, for rank superstition ; but we can have no right to deny, that so at all events the faith of the Christian world stood in the third century, and that it was of one complexion thus with what we have found to be the general church system of Cyprian. Christianity, as it then prevailed, was conditioned absolutely and essentially by this system. The church was made to be the pillar and ground of the universal fact. We see this, not merely in the direct statements which are made on the subject, but in some respects more impressively still in forms of thought and life by which in an indirect way it is continually taken for granted. The doctrine is not met in the form of an outward accident only ; we find it wrought into the whole religious mind of the age ; it is of one growth with this, concrete with its very existence, we might almost say, at every point. It is implied in the controversy concerning the restoration of the lapsed. It lies in all the premises, which entered into the reigning system of church discipline, in the eagerness of penitents to secure the peace of the church, in the forms and rules which governed its mysterious communication. It formed the soul of the question concerning the baptism of heretics. It lay at the foundation of the views which were entertained of the vast merit of martyrdom, of the communion of saints, of the power of the holy sacraments, and we may say indeed of the universal theology of the age. All is constructed on the assumption of the Divine constitution of the Church, under such form of objective reality as we have now in consideration. Cyprian's writings are everywhere an appeal to this fact. He deals in no speculation ; brings in no theory of his own ; but throws himself perpetually on what he holds to be the living sense of Christianity, in the consciousness of that world of faith generally to which the mystery belonged. And this precisely it was, that clothed his writings with power. They came home to the heart and mind of the church, as an echo for the most part of its universally acknowledged faith.

But such a faith thus universally established in the middle of the third century, could not have sprung up like a mushroom in the night, could not have been the growth of a single day or year. It creates of itself at once a mighty presumption, that it had come down by general tradition from the time going before ; and if there be no clear evidence to the contrary, this tradition or handing down must be taken to reach away back to the earliest date of ecclesiastical history. It is asking a great deal too much, in such a case, when we are required to set out with just the opposite presumption ; and are gravely told that, not the fact

of variation here, but the fact of identity, is that which needs to be made out at every upward step of such inquiry by direct overwhelming proof. The only truly logical and philosophical view is that which takes the sameness for granted, till the fact of some actual change is demonstrated. Such a state of things as we meet with, throughout the length and breadth of the Christian world, in the time of Cyprian, whose own life reached back to the beginning of the century, and who stood in such close theological relation with Tertullian, the great connecting link between the third century and the second, most conclusively implies that substantially the same order of thought and life had prevailed also in this earlier period. It is not possible to account satisfactorily for the later known fact on any other hypothesis. And more especially must this be felt to be the case, when it is borne in mind that the authority of such a tradition, in favor of the later system, was always boldly asserted, and that so far as we know the assertion never met with contradiction in any quarter. For even Neander has not pretended to say, that either Novatian or Felicissimus ever appealed to any older doctrine or practice, as being in opposition to the high church pretensions by which they were resisted in their schismatical designs; as they would have done certainly in their own defence, if the thing had been at all possible; and it seems to us therefore to be no better than the most puerile romance, when the great historian chooses to make their factions notwithstanding, especially that of the last, the representation of a hypothetical anti-hierarchical interest in the church, which with the advantage of antiquity and right religious feeling on its side, was no longer able now to maintain its ground. So far as episcopacy was concerned, the tradition of which we now speak carried it back distinctly, as we have before said, to the age of the Apostles. The bishops were held to be their successors in office, the bearers of the same commission which these had received in the beginning to teach all nations; and the line of this succession, in the case of the different sees, was in fact traced up to the very time when they were first established; a task, which was then just as easy as it would be now to carry back the succession of any well established civil magistracy for a like comparatively short period of years.

But we are not left to this form of proof alone, strong as it must be allowed to be in the full posture of the case. We can appeal directly to the voice of the second century itself.

All the writers of this period speak familiarly of the government of the church by bishops, who were regarded as holding

their office by legitimate succession from the Apostles. Tertullian and Irenaeus, in controversy with the heretics of their time, appeal to the course of this succession in the case of certain prominent sees as an open clearly established fact, which could be verified for any inquirer without the least difficulty or trouble. And what right can any one have now, to call in question the credibility of their statement, or to suppose that it was founded on some sort of mistake? It would be just as reasonable to question an appeal, at the present time, to the Gubernatorial succession of Pennsylvania, or Massachusetts, or New-York, since the date of the American Revolution, in proof of the historical identity of the government of either of these notable Commonwealths between the years 1776 and 1852. There was just as little room for uncertainty in the one case as in the other. "Come then," says Tertullian in his celebrated tract on *Prescription*, "you who wish to exercise your curiosity to more advantage in the affair of salvation, go through the apostolic churches, in which the very chairs of the apostles continue aloft in their places, in which their very original letters are recited, sounding forth the voice and representing the countenance of each one. Is Achaia near you? You have Corinth. If you are not far from Macedon, you have Philippi, you have Thessalonica. If you can go to Asia, you have Ephesus. If you are near Italy, you have Rome, whence we also derive our origin. How happy is this church, to which the apostles poured forth their whole doctrine with their blood! where Peter is assimilated to the Lord in his martyrdom: where Paul is crowned with a death like that of John: where John the apostle, after he had been dipped in boiling oil without suffering injury, is banished to the island: let us see what she learned, what she taught, what she professed in her symbol in common with the African churches" (c. 36). The heretics are boldly challenged to produce any similar warrant for their pretensions. "Let them then give us the origin of their churches; let them unfold the series of their bishops, [they too, it seems, knew of no other form of church polity,] coming down from the beginning in succession, so that the first bishop shall appear to have been appointed and preceded by some one of the apostles or apostolic men, without having fallen off subsequently from their communion. For in this way the apostolic churches trace their descent; as the church of Smyrna, for instance, refers to Polycarp constituted by John, and the church of the Romans to Clement ordained by Peter. In like manner also the other churches show those who were appointed to the episcopate by the apostles, and so

made channels of the apostolic seed. Let the heretics feign anything like this" (c. 32). Irenaeus, the disciple of Polycarp, had argued against the false teachers of his time in precisely the same strain. "All who wish to see the truth," he says, "may see in the entire Church the tradition of the apostles, manifested throughout the whole world; and we can enumerate the bishops who have been ordained by the apostles, and their successors down to our time, who taught or knew no such doctrine as they madly dream of. But since it would be very tedious to enumerate in this work the succession of all the churches, by pointing to the tradition of the greatest and most ancient church, known to all, founded and established at Rome by the two most glorious apostles Peter and Paul, and to her faith announced to men which comes down to us also by the succession of bishops, we confound all those who in any improper manner gather together, either through self-complacency, or vain-glory, or blindness and perverse disposition. For with this church, on account of her more powerful principality, it is necessary that every church, that is the faithful on all sides round, should agree, in which the apostolic tradition has been always preserved by those on all sides" (l. iii. c. 3). No one needs to be informed of the doctrine of Ignatius on the same subject, which itself sets us almost in felt contact with the last of the Apostles. His glorification of episcopacy, as the ground of all stability and the channel of all grace in the church, is an old topic, familiar to all who have bestowed on the Episcopalian controversy of modern times even the least attention. The very fulness and force of his testimony are made, by those who cannot bear it, a reason for disputing its truth. Their own foregone conclusion would be at once upset by its clear distinct voice; and so, to save their conclusion, they set themselves to smother the voice as they best can, by taking it for granted that it is surreptitious and false, something palmed upon the real Ignatius by the pious fraud of a later age. Professor Rothe, in his great work *Die Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche*, has well exposed the arbitrary and absurd character of this wholesale scepticism. The truth is the Episcopal passages of Ignatius, as they may be called, have not as such the slightest air of forgery or interpolation; they fall in naturally and easily with his general train of thought, and stand in close connection with the whole form and habit of his theology. This will be shown presently, when we come to consider more particularly the view he takes of the Church. And just as little room is there to say, that the style of thinking here brought into view does not agree with the age of Ignatius, but

is made to anticipate unnaturally what belongs of right only to the next century. It is easy to see, that it is not identical in any such way with the thinking of this later time, that it bears upon it the marks of an earlier stage of the Christian life, and that it fits well with the ecclesiastical and theological connections of the period to which it is thus referred, so far as we have any knowledge of them from other sources. The Epistles of Ignatius, in their generally accepted form, are just such a light in truth as we need to find our way in ecclesiastical history, with any sort of intelligence, from the first century over into the bosom of the second, from the age of the Apostles onward to the order of things which stares us in the face in the days of Irenaeus and Tertullian. Extinguish this light, refuse to acknowledge what it reveals, violently *theorize* into the place of this another scheme of church facts altogether; and it is not too much to say, that the whole history of the second century must be brought at the same time into inextricable confusion.

We are not concerned particularly at present, however, with the question of Episcopacy. It is plain enough, that the government of the church, in the second century, was in this form; and we think it sufficiently clear also, that the See of Rome was regarded as possessing a central dignity in the system, a sort of actual *principality*, derived from the original primacy of St. Peter. But for our main purpose just now, this is of only secondary account. What we seek, is to determine the view taken of the constitution of the Church itself inwardly considered. This is something back of all questions concerning its outward polity, even though such polity be regarded as Divine, and as essentially blended thus with the very existence of the organization to which it may belong. Waiving then the abstract controversy between Presbytery as such and Prelacy, as well as that between both of these together and the Papacy, we go on to show that the second century throughout held the same view of the general nature and constitution of the Church, which we have already found to underlie the scheme of Cyprian in the third. According to this view, the Church is a supernatural fact in the world under an outward historical form, a real constitution established by extraordinary Divine commission and destined to endure to the end of time, with powers and functions answerable to such high character. It grows at the same time with inward necessity, from the mystery of the Saviour's incarnation, including his resurrection and glorification, according to the order exhibited in the Apostles' Creed. In such view, it is the actual home of the grace and truth here brought to light for

the salvation of dying men, not an external accident simply of Christianity, but a fundamental part of its very constitution, the medium by which it is made actual, the body through which as an organ it works, in the world. Submission to this outwardly real constitution is the true obedience of faith, in which all salvation begins, and baptism as a true objective response to such act of submission is a sacrament of regeneration introducing the subject into the heavenly order of life to which it belongs, and giving him a title to all its privileges, with the full real possibility of eternal salvation. So constituted, the Church is necessarily one, and catholic, and holy, and apostolical, carrying in it the positive whole of Christianity, and absolutely excluding as false and profane all that is external to its own communion. Schism becomes thus at once a mortal sin, of one nature with heresy; to be out of the church is to be cut off from the fountains of salvation in every other form; the bible, the sacraments, the ministry, are streams of life only within this mystical paradise, not on the outside of it; no one can have God for his father, who has not this visible and actual Church for his mother. Such, we say, is the general theory. We are not presenting it now as necessarily right and true. We propose only to show, that it was universally held in the second century.

The truth is, however, it is not easy to know where to begin with the evidence, or how to arrange it, just because it is so abundant and full. So soon as we lay aside all stubborn preconceptions, and endeavor simply to take the age on its own standpoint, we shall find that its whole theological life is constructed on the basis precisely of the scheme now stated, and that its utterances become clear and intelligible only in proportion as we make it a key for their interpretation. To understand Tertullian, Irenaeus, or Ignatius, to be able to read their writings, with any true religious interest or satisfaction, the most indispensable of all conditions is just that we should have power to perceive this fact, and power at the same time to make ourselves at home—hypothetically at least if not by conviction of its truth—in the animus of their faith as exercised in such intensely realistic style.

On the apostolicity of the church, its Divine commission, the realness of its constitution as a fact handed down by unbroken continuous succession from the beginning, Tertullian's tract in particular on the Prescription of Heretics might be given at large. He puts down all heresies, by asserting in favor of the church the right of possession and regular inheritance, over against which every later claim must be held at once for a false

and unlawful usurpation. Christ, he tells us, who knew his own doctrine, chose twelve of his leading disciples to be the teachers of it to the nations. "These apostles, whose name signifies *sent* . . . having obtained the promised power of the Holy Ghost for miracles and speech, and having preached the faith and established churches first in Judea, afterwards went forth into the world at large and proclaimed the same teaching of the same faith to the nations; and then they founded churches in every city from which other churches afterwards borrowed the graft of faith and seed of doctrine, and are continually doing so still in order to become churches. And in this way these also are reckoned apostolical, as being the progeny of apostolical churches. Every kind must of course be referred to its origin. Hence however many churches there may be, that which was first from the apostles is one, of which come all. Thus all are the first and apostolical, whilst all as one show their unity, by communication of peace, and title of brotherhood and mutual pledge of hospitality; rights, which no other reason regulates save one tradition of the same sacrament. From this then we draw the prescription: that if our Lord Jesus Christ sent apostles to preach, no other preachers are to be received than those whom he commissioned, because no other has known the Father but the Son and he to whom the Son has revealed him, and to no others does the Son appear to have made such revelation but to the apostles, whom he sent to preach of course what he revealed. But what they preached, that is, what Christ revealed to them, I will here also lay down the rule, ought not to be proved otherwise than by the same churches, which the apostles themselves founded, by preaching to them with the living voice as they call it, as well as afterwards by their letters. If these things be so, it is clear thence that all doctrine which agrees with those apostolical churches, the matrices and originals of the faith, is to be reckoned as true, exhibiting without doubt what the churches received from the apostles, the apostles from Christ, and Christ from God; but that all other doctrine is to be forejudged as false, the taste of which is against the truth of the churches, and of the apostles, and of Christ, and of God. It remains then that we show, whether our doctrine, whose rule we have already given, is to be reckoned of apostolical tradition, and from this itself whether all besides must be referred to falsehood. We communicate with the apostolical churches, which is done by no different doctrine: this is the test of truth" (c. 20, 21). This passage brings into view also Tertullian's idea of the necessary unity of the church. However many particular

churches there may be, they are all in truth one by virtue of their common apostolical origin and life. Each one is what it professes to be, in the bosom only of the general organization of which it is thus a part. So in other places, he speaks of such churches as bound together, in distinction from all heretical assemblies, by a common "right of peace and title of brotherhood;" they have "one faith, one God, the same Christ, the same hope, the same sacramental laver." What belongs to one belongs to all; "nostrum est quodcunque nostrorum est." They are all "confederated by sacramental association" (*de societate sacramenti confoederantur*). Unity implies exclusiveness, in other words the restriction of the Christian salvation to the church, as being its real medium and organ. This thought also is familiar to Tertullian. He lays stress on the maternity of church; and makes use of the subsequently classic symbol of Noah's ark, to express its relation to the surrounding world.

On all these points, the still older testimony of Irenaeus is yet more explicit and direct, as well as far more large and full. He too puts down the cause of all heretics by the plea of prescription, original occupancy and prior right on the part of the church, which he views always as a single corporation, in full unity with itself and of unbroken succession from the time of the apostles. The church is universal, "diffused through the whole world to the ends of the earth." As such again it is exclusive, allowing no rivalry with its proper functions under any different form. He sees in it always the definite and only channel of the historical progress of the work of redemption, the only organ of Christ's redeeming activity in the world, the only possessor of the powers of the Christian salvation, that is, in one word, of the Holy Ghost. Here alone are deposited all the treasures of grace; and here accordingly they are, at the same time, in absolutely full measure. In the church only is to be found the complete truth. She is the only possessor and guardian of the true holy scriptures. She is, in the most manifold relations, the mother, and the only mother, of all who belong to Christ. To be out of her bosom, by heresy or schism, is death. In the remarkable passage, *Adv. Haer.* l. iii. c. 24, §. 1, he speaks of the whole economy of the Gospel, as an objective system set forth everywhere under the same form, which we comprehend in our faith, as we receive this to keep from the church, where the Spirit of God always resides, like some rich unguent in a good vessel, "*juvenescens et juvenescere faciens ipsum vas in quo est,*" the source of a perennially new and fresh life. "For this gift of God is bestowed upon the church, like the breath of

life to the natural man, that all the members by partaking of it may be made alive ; and in her is arranged the communication of Christ, that is the Holy Ghost, the pledge of incorruption, and the confirmation of our faith, and the scale of ascension to God. For in the church, it is said, God has placed apostles, prophets, teachers, and every other operation of the Spirit ; of which all fail to partake, who have not recourse to the church, but cheat themselves of life by wrong judgment and pernicious work. For where the church is, there is also the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is, there is the church and all grace ; but the Spirit is truth. Wherefore such as fail to partake of him are neither nourished by the breasts of the mother into life, nor participate in the most pure fountain that proceeds from the body of Christ, but dig out for themselves broken cisterns of the earth, and drink water filled with mud, avoiding the faith of the church so as not to be converted, and rejecting the Spirit so as not to be amended." Again, l. v. c. 20. §. 2 : " We must then flee the opinions of heretics, and carefully watch against their infestations ; but must take refuge in the church, and be educated in her bosom and nourished by the Lord's scriptures. For the church is planted as a paradise or garden in this world. So of every tree of the garden ye shall eat, saith the Spirit of God, that is, eat ye of every scripture of the Lord ; but ye shall not eat of knowledge pretending to be above this, nor touch the whole dissent of heretics. For they themselves avow, that they have the knowledge of good and evil, and set up their impious sense above God who made them. They think thus above the measure of thought. Wherefore also the Apostle says, we must not think more highly than we ought to think, but should think soberly ; that we may not, by eating of their knowledge, that namely which is thus too high, be thrust out from the paradise of life, into which the Lord brings those who obey his command, ' gathering together in one all things in himself both which are in heaven and which are on earth.' But what is in heaven are spiritual things, what is on earth is the economy of man. Gathering these into one therefore in himself, uniting man to the Spirit and placing the Spirit in man, he has become the head of the Spirit, and gives the Spirit to be the head of man : for through him we see, and have heard and do speak." So again, l. iii. c. 4, §. 1 : " It is not necessary to seek from others the truth, which it is so easy to receive from the church, since the apostles have most fully committed to her, as a rich depository, all that is of the truth, that every one who will may take thence the water of life. For

she is the entrance into life, while all others are thieves and robbers. On which account, we are to shun them, and to regard with diligent affection what is of the church, holding fast the tradition of truth." On the unity of the church, the same writer, as is well known to all who have any knowledge of him, is particularly clear and emphatic. He makes it to consist in identity of doctrine and confession, in community of faith, in the participation of the same Holy Ghost, and expressly also in the power of a common ecclesiastical organization, held together by the general bond of the episcopate in its collective or consolidated view. "Though spread over the whole world to the ends of the earth, the church still holds one faith received from the apostles and their disciples. . . . This proclamation and this creed so received, she sedulously guards, notwithstanding her diffusion throughout the world, as if she occupied but one house; she believes them alike as if she had one soul and the same heart, and harmoniously proclaims and teaches them, and hands them down, as though she were possessed of but a single voice. The dialects, as regards the world, are indeed different; but the force of the tradition is one and the same. . . . For as the sun, God's creature, is through the whole world one and the same, so also the proclamation of the truth shines in every direction, and enlightens all men who are willing to come to the knowledge of the truth" Adv. Haer. I. 10, §. 1, 2.—"Wherefore it is necessary to hearken to the presbyters in the church, to those who have the succession from the apostles, as we have shown, who along with the succession of the episcopate have received the sure gift of truth according to the good pleasure of the Father; while all others, who stand aside from the reigning succession, and convene together in any place, are to be held in suspicion, either as heretics of bad doctrine, or as proud and self-pleasing schismatics, or finally as hypocrites actuated by the desire of gain and vain glory. All such are fallen from the truth. . . . From all such therefore it is a duty to abstain, but to adhere to those, who both keep the doctrine of the apostles, as we have said before, and along with the order of the eldership exhibit sound speech and a life without offence for the confirmation and reproof of others" Ib. iv. c. 20, §. 2, 4. The true Christian gnosis is represented as resting, iv. c. 33, §. 8, in two elements, the doctrine of the apostles and the church system derived from them, by episcopal succession, throughout the world. "Agnitio vera est apostolorum doctrina et antiquus ecclesiae status in universo mundo et character corporis Christi

secundum successiones episcoporum, quibus illi eam, quae in uno quoque loco est, ecclesiam tradiderunt."

How deeply seated this whole view of the unity and exclusiveness of the church was in the faith of this early time, is strikingly shown in the usual mode of denouncing heretics and heresies. The two conceptions of heresy and schism are always regarded as flowing more or less together. The error of judgment is always taken to be something, that grows out of an evil heart of disobedience towards an actual teaching authority, which all are required at once to acknowledge and obey. The truth as it is in Christ is never viewed as the sense simply of a written revelation, which men are expected to understand as they best can and so set up as an object of faith. It is primarily a *tradition*, a system handed down from the apostles under a tangible objective form, in the bosom of a constitution which is itself part of the revelation, and which challenges to itself the homage and submission of all in such view, as the indispensable condition of their having any lot or part in the grace which is thus placed within their reach. It is continually taken for granted, that this outward authority is clearly defined and constantly at hand, so as to leave no apology or excuse for falling into heresy in any form. Heretics are necessarily and at once rebels against a regularly constituted authority, which they are bound to obey; and this rebellion, in the circumstances, amounts to a virtual renunciation of the Divine supremacy of Christianity itself. It involves the guilt of schism, rupture with the evangelical tradition, a violent breaking away from the actual living order of the Gospel; and this, of course, can be nothing less in the end than downright infidelity. Such, we say, is the light in which it is regarded and spoken of always by the early fathers. We have seen already how Tertullian and Irenaeus make use of the argument from prescription. They put down all heresies as innovations and invasions upon long established right. The church is in actual possession of the truth; it belongs to her by inheritance; her title deeds reach back plainly to the original charter of Christianity. What right then can any other party have, to come in and dispute her authority? Heresy is, by its very conception, the setting up of mere private will against law and right. It expresses precisely the opposite of the attribute *catholic*, as this enters necessarily into the constitution of the real and true church. It carries in it at once the notion of sect, something cut off from the proper whole of Christianity, the substitution of what is private and subjective, matter of wil-

ful choice, αἵρεσις, for what is objective and general.¹ All such particularism, in the sphere of Christianity, must be irreligious, a work of the flesh (Gal. v : 20), a virtual denial and abandonment of the faith. The heretic is to be considered αὐτοκατάκριτος, self condemned (Tit. iii : 10, 11); as one who voluntarily disowns and gives up the Christian principle, the fundamental maxim of the obedience of faith. He is condemned, says Tertullian, “in quo sibi elegit,” by the matter of his own election. “We have no right,” he adds, “to bring in anything of our own will, nor yet to choose what any one else may have brought in of his mere will” (De Praesc. c. 6). That is his notion of religious liberty and private judgment; which he backs by the authority of our Lord’s apostles; for even they, he tells us, did not choose what they should teach, but “faithfully delivered to the nations the discipline they had received from Christ.” Heresies are in this way always the fruit of the fleshly mind as such, acting in opposition to the mind of the Spirit. “Wo to those,” cries Origen, “who despise the church, and trust in the arrogance and swelling words of heretics.” There are three habits of the soul, according to Clemens Alexandrinus, ignorance, opinion, knowledge; the first is that of the heathen, the last belongs to the true church, while the character of heresy is found in the second. It puts the merely subjective into the room of the objective, mistakes its own fancies for heavenly realities. Christianity in this form ceased to be a church, and became a school. The attributes belonging to it as the body of Christ, were lost in the narrow conception of mere human party or sect. This is often held up by the early fathers in the way of reproach. Heretics, according to Tertullian, seemed to have no sense at all for unity or catholicity; and just for this reason, they were uncommonly liberal and tolerant, planting themselves on the ground that there should be free inquiry in religion, and liberty also to change opinion as often as it might be found necessary. “They join peace on all sides,” says Tertullian, “and make no account of their own differences, whilst they band themselves together to make war upon the one truth.” “They can hardly be said to have any schisms; because when they exist, they come not into view. Schism is their unity. They do not even adhere among themselves to their own systems, but

¹ So Athanasius : Πᾶθεν λέγεται αἵρεσις ; Δπο του αἰρεῖσθαι τι ἴδιον, καὶ τοῦτο ἱσακολουθεῖν.—So Tertullian : Haereses dictae graeca voce ex interpretatione electionis, qua quis, sive ad instituendas sive ad suscipiendas eas, nititur.

every one modifies by private judgment what he has received, just as this was concocted by private judgment on the part of his teacher. The course the thing takes tells its nature and the manner of its commencement. The Valentinians have as much sight as Valentinus, the Marcionites as much as Marcion, to alter the faith at their own pleasure. And so all heresies, when carefully examined, are found to disagree in many things with their authors" (De Praesc. c. 41, 42). They showed a common tendency, according to the Apostolical Constitutions, vi: 10, to treat religious differences as of no material account. They affected to care only for practical piety. They laid great stress on following the Scriptures; and were fond of appealing to such texts as, "Seek, and ye shall find," "Prove all things, &c.," in justification of their restless unsettled habit. "They are forever pretending to *seek*," says Irenaeus, "as persons without sight, but are never able to find." All with them is matter of opinion; whereas the idea of faith requires something fixed and sure, in the way of outward objective tradition, that may be submitted to in such view as the firm ground of the Christian life.

Holding such relation to the Catholic Church, heresies are condemned always in the most unsparing terms. By no possibility can they be either safe or right. It is common to refer them directly to the instigation of the Devil. "Heretics are all apostates from the truth," according to Irenaeus, Adv. haer. iv: 26, §. 2; "and as they offer strange fire on the altar of God, that is strange doctrines, they shall be consumed by fire from heaven, like Nadab and Abihu. As rising up against the truth, and exhorting others against the church, they abide in hell, swallowed up of the opening earth, like the company of Korah, Dathan and Abiram. As dividing and separating the church, they fall into the punishment of Jeroboam." Origen on Rom. xiv: 22, 23, *Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God, &c.*, proceeds in the following strain: "Some one may ask, if heretics also, because they act according to what they believe, may be supposed to act from faith. In my view, we should call it their credulity rather than faith. For as false prophets are sometimes improperly called prophets, and false science is said to be science, and false wisdom is termed wisdom; so the credulity of heretics is by a false name designated faith. Whence it is to be considered, whether even if any good work may seem to have place among them, it is not perhaps converted into sin, as it is said of one, *Let his prayer be turned into sin*. There is a chiasm at times, which is not of faith, &c., &c. There is thus a false faith of such as *concerning faith have made ship-*

wreck, there is a false wisdom also of *this world and of the princes of this world*, which shall be destroyed. For as pirates are accustomed to kindle a fire under cover of night, near shallow and rocky parts of the sea, by which they may draw mariners, through hope of reaching a safe haven, into ruinous shipwreck ; so also is that light of false wisdom or false faith kindled by the princes of the world and the powers of the air, not that men may escape, but that they may perish, in their voyage on the sea of life and through the waves of this present world." What we need to observe, is the opposition in which heresy is made to stand to the idea of the church, as something individual and private, in the form of opinion or speculation, over against an authority which is assumed to be at hand under the character of a known positive constitution, demanding submission not as a matter of opinion but as an act of faith. The sense of this opposition, and this particular conception of the nature of faith, may be said to enter into the universal thinking of the ancient church, and come into view more or less clearly wherever the subject of heresy is brought in any way under consideration.

What Irenaeus relates of Polycarp, and his well known story concerning St. John, falls in exactly with this habit of thought, and must be taken as a true picture here at all events of the mind of the first half of the second century, whatever may be made of the story in question ; which itself, however, would seem to be open to no reasonable doubt. Polycarp, we are told, during his visit to Rome in the time of Anicetus, converted many heretics to the church, by simply announcing the truth he had been accustomed to teach in Asia as having been received and delivered to him by the Apostles. " And there are those," Irenaeus adds, " who have heard him say, that John, the disciple of the Lord, having entered a bathing house in Ephesus, when he learned that Cerinthus was also within, hastened out of the place before he had washed, saying he feared the building might fall having Cerinthus in it, the enemy of the truth. Polycarp himself also, when Marcion once met him and asked, *Dost thou know us ?* replied, *I do know thee as the first born of Satan*. Such fear had the Apostles and their disciples of communicating, even to a word, with any of those who corrupted the truth."

The whole thinking of this early period, we say, is based upon the idea of the church which we have now under consideration. No quotation in regard to particular points can do the subject any sort of justice. There is danger rather of their

serving to enfeeble the argument they should support, by their necessarily partial character and isolated form. Their full proper force can be felt only in the bosom of the living connections, from the midst of which they are taken. To understand the theology or worship of the primitive church, as it comes before us in the most ancient fathers, at almost any point, we must be able to throw our minds into the posture of this idea, and to conceive of the church, hypothetically at least, as a Divine constitution, embodying in itself in a real way the powers of the Christian salvation, "the fulness of him that filleth all in all." Take, for example, the single point of baptismal regeneration. No thought is more familiar to this early Christianity, than that baptism is of force really and truly for the remission of sins, and to bring men into saving relation with God. It is spoken of continually as an illuminating, cleansing, renovating sacrament. It is made everywhere to be the basis and foundation of the Christian life. All this too, without the least sign of hesitation or embarrassment, in the most ready and matter-of-course style, as though the point were open to no difficulty and understood all round to be a first principle of the doctrine of Christ. To say, that such phraseology was mere rhetoric, or flourish of high sounding words known to be hollow figure and falsehood at last, is an insult on the ancient church worthy only the pen of Gibbon or the tongue of Voltaire. It simply shows, what earnest was then made with the objective realness of the church. Suppose Christianity a doctrine only, a simply spiritualistic system in the modern Puritan or Methodistic sense, and then indeed all such phraseology becomes more or less unmeaning bombast, the credit of which can be saved only by such violent qualification as must turn the whole of it at last into frigid nonsense. But *suppose* only the actual presence of righteousness and salvation in the church, as a known outward and historical corporation, the full possibility of redemption brought home *there* to all who can be led to believe and embrace the joyful intelligence, and who may not see that the difficulty of all these startling forms of speech is at once brought comparatively to an end? In proportion precisely as this view can be reproduced in any modern mind in a lively way, it will be found to carry in it all the key that is needed, to solve the otherwise inexplicable enigma of the old ecclesiastical *usus loquendi*, on the subject of holy baptism. And so with regard to other points. All are conditioned by faith in the article of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, as being the spouse of God, the mother of saints, the real medium of salvation and fountain of life to a dying world. That is the

universal standpoint of Christian antiquity ; and to understand it, or do it any sort of justice, we must be able, both in mind and heart, to *think* ourselves into the same position. With regard to this whole subject, there is too much reason to apprehend, antiquity might say to most of us, as St. Paul says to the Corinthians : “ Ye are not straitened in us, but ye are straitened in your own bowels ! ”

When we look into the Apostolical Fathers, as they are called, we find plainly enough this same general view of the church, which is carried back thus to the very feet, as it were, of the Blessed Apostles themselves. The question, let it be still kept well in mind, is not immediately concerning episcopacy or any other such single interest separately considered. Much has been done to darken the subject, by taking it in this way. The grand point is the conception of the church, and the view taken of its relations to the Christian salvation. Here, we say, all is plain. There is not the least evidence of any real contradiction, so far as this great subject is concerned, between the commencement and the close of the second century. No violent chasm appears, sundering the period of Polycarp, Ignatius and the Roman Clement, from that of Irenaeus and Tertullian. Few as our notices are of the ecclesiastical life of this older time, they are abundantly sufficient to show that the idea of the church, as we find it afterwards everywhere received, was then in full force, ruling both the theory and the practice of religion on all sides. It was held to be a Divine constitution ; it was regarded as the real home of the Spirit, and the organ and channel thus of all grace. It was in this view one, universal, and alone, the *Catholic Church* in the full sense of this most significant name, the grand and glorious mystery of the Creed. Men must bow to its authority in this form, in order to be saved. To do so, is faith ; not to do so, involves at once the full condemnation of disobedience and unbelief. This clearly is the theory, whether true or false, which underlies all the religious thinking of the Apostolical Fathers.

The church of Smyrna, in its Epistle on the martyrdom of Polycarp, speaks of all the *κατοιχίας* of the “ holy catholic church ” in every place ; and tells how Polycarp remembered, in his last prayer, “ the whole catholic church throughout the world. ” Hermas represents the same conception by his symbolical tower, “ which appeared throughout of one color, shining like the brightness of the sun, ” though made up of believers from all nations under heaven, made to be of one mind by their common faith. The whole is as though made of one stone.

Not to be in the structure of the tower, is to be reprobate. The rejected stones lying around it signify "such as have known the truth, but have not continued in it, and are not joined with the saints." The ideas of heresy and schism run into each other, as a common falling away from the historical fact of the church, carrying along with it in some way its own determinate outward form. "It is better," says Clement of Rome, "that you should be found small and have place in the flock of Christ, than that you should be thrust out from his hope in aspiring to be high." This is addressed to those who opposed the presbyters in Corinth, and is a call upon them to submit to the church in its proper ministry; in which view, it is plain, exclusion from the hope of Christ, is made to be just one and the same thing with excommunication from his flock in this outward form.

Ignatius is much more explicit and full. His system is clearly the same with that of Cyprian, though bearing evidently enough also the characteristic marks of an earlier age. All depends, with him, on being in union with the bishop, and so with the church over which he presides, in the name and with the authority of Christ. "Let no one deceive himself," he writes to the Ephesians, c. 5, "if any one be not within the altar, he is destitute of the bread of God." Again *ad Trall.* c. 7: "He that is within the altar is clean, he that is without is not clean; that is, whoever does anything apart from the bishop and the presbytery and the deacon, he is not clean in his conscience." Heretics are stigmatised, *ad Philad.* c. 3, as "evil plants on which Christ bestows no care, because they are not of the Father's planting," and then it follows: "If any one follow a schismatic, he has no inheritance in the kingdom of God." Again, *ad Smyrn.* c. 4, heretics are denounced as "wild beasts in human shape, whom we are not only not to receive, but if possible not even to meet; praying for them only, if perchance they may come to repentance; which indeed is difficult; but still not beyond the power of Jesus Christ, our true life." Afterwards they are described as bringing in other opinions (heterodoxies) against the grace of Jesus Christ, contradicting the mind of God, and making no account of charity; and then it is added, c. 7: "They abstain from the eucharist and prayer, as not acknowledging the eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, given for our sins and raised again through the goodness of the Father. Opposing the gift of God disputatiously they die, whereas to continue in charity would be better for them that they might rise again. It is proper therefore to have nothing to do with such." Here plainly heresy is the setting up of private

opinion against what is at hand for faith in the form of known outward authority, which necessarily involves therefore a breach of charity, the rupture of unity, and so a falling away from the real life and immortality which Christ has lodged in the church exclusively under its whole form, as his own mystical body. *Heterodoxy* thus comes to its full sense. It is not one opinion merely pitted against another *opinion* ; but opinion as such, in any and every shape, over against faith, and the fixed outward tradition which this is required to receive and obey.

• Three topics mainly make up the argument or theme of the Ignatian Epistles; first, the danger to be apprehended from heretics, particularly such as turned the fact of the incarnation into a Gnostic dream; secondly, the vast importance of maintaining the unity of the church; and finally, the great duty of cleaving firmly to the bishop, at the head of his presbyters and deacons, with absolute subjection to his authority. These heads are not brought forward in separate and distinct form; they are made continually to flow into one another, and are so woven together as to show that they are, in the mind of the writer, inwardly related always in the way of cause and effect. The danger of heresy leads him to press the object of church unity, as the only effectual security against its seductive power; and zeal for this interest of unity again becomes a motive to enforce unconditional obedience to the bishops, as the means specially ordained and required for its preservation. No mistake can be greater than to suppose that the glorification of the episcopate with Ignatius is lugged in without other reason for the mere sake of the office itself, or to promote a simply hierarchical interest. It flows as naturally as possible from the burden of his zeal for the spiritual welfare of the churches to which he wrote; and to understand it fully, we need only to make ourselves familiar with the general conception of Christianity in which his spirit moved and had its home. All faith with him, it is plain, stands primarily in an act of submission to the Christian salvation as an outward fact, starting in the mystery of the incarnation and reaching forward from this under a form of existence altogether peculiar to itself in the church. So apprehended it must be necessarily one and whole, in unity and harmony always with itself. The objective, in the nature of the case, must rule and condition the subjective, the new creation can owe nothing to private judgment or private will. The setting up of any such pretension is at once heresy, *αἵρεσις*, something insurrectionary and rebellious over against the concrete fact of Christianity in its own form. It is to be deprecated and resisted, accordingly,

just on this account. The force of the evil is not merely nor primarily in its error of doctrine theoretically considered ; it lies rather in the attempt to substitute opinion in some form for the authority of tradition. This, whether the opinion be in one form or in another, strikes at the very foundation of the Christian mystery, and includes in itself necessarily the idea of division and schism. To hold fast the unity of the church, becomes then the indispensable and only sufficient means of preserving and maintaining the truth. The ground and bond of this unity, Ignatius sees in the episcopate. The bishops represent the authority of Christ, and each of them may be said to gather up in himself as a centre the religious life of the particular church over which he presides. Their general charge is at the same time collegiate, like that of the original Apostles from whom they hold their powers in the way of legitimate succession. To be in unity then with itself, and so with the universal or catholic church, and to be secure thus against the invasions of heresy, each particular congregation must remain in close communion with its own bishop and in absolute submission to his authority. This becomes with Ignatius, in such view, a cardinal and fundamental interest. Both the other interests depend upon it ; and for this reason, he lays upon it everywhere the main stress of his exhortation, in a way that is apt to strike much of our modern thinking as extravagant and ridiculously absurd.

It would carry us too far to exemplify what we have now said by quotations. Nor is it necessary. No one who knows anything of Ignatius' can need to be informed, what constant stress he lays on submission to the bishop, with his presbyters and deacons, as the very ideal of perfection and prosperity in the condition of every church. His general strain is : " Do nothing without the bishop ; keep your flesh as the temple of God ; love unity and flee divisions ; be ye imitators of Christ, as he is also of the Father. I have done my part, as a man set for unity. Where there is division and wrath, God abides not. To all who repent the Lord will grant forgiveness, if they repent to the unity of God and communication with the bishop" (*ad Philad.* c. 7, 8,). " Hold to the bishops, that God may be with you. I go bail for those who are in subjection to the bishop, the presbyters, the deacons ; and with them let me have my part in God" *ad Polyc.* c. 6). Our concern here is not just with Episcopacy. It is with the idea of the church, which must be taken necessarily to lie at the bottom of this view. It is not the episcopate, under any and every view, that carries in it such title to respect. The case supposes a real Divine constitution,

in the bosom of which only the office can be of any heavenly force, and where at the same time it must be in some way the power of a single fact, an office through all its parts in unity with itself, representing thus, not in figure only but in fact, the authority of Jesus Christ in its own proper undivided form. If the Church were a human organization simply, or subject to the limitations and conditions of our human life naturally considered, it would be indeed absurd to talk of its Ministry in this style, and such exaltation of the duty of obedience to it, as the great law of unity and so of security against heresy, might well be considered anything but reasonable and safe. But Ignatius looked upon the case in no such light. All his language implies, that he took the Church to be in truth a supernatural constitution, which as such was to be regarded as of absolute and supreme sufficiency within itself for its own ends. The first duty of all men accordingly is to submit to it in such outwardly objective form. All the ends of righteousness and salvation depend upon acknowledging it, and bowing to it, precisely in this view. Nothing can well be more remote from the independent sectarian notion of religion, that prevails so extensively at the present day. But it falls in with the universal thinking of the church in the first ages.

The Cyprianic doctrine of the church falls back thus, in its fundamental conception, to the earliest Christian time. It was no innovation of the third century upon the faith of the second. However it may have been with the age of the New Testament, it is certain that as soon as we pass beyond that we find ourselves surrounded on all sides with modes of thought, and forms of religious life, which involve at bottom this very scheme as carrying in it the true sense and force of the Christian salvation. So after the third century, its authority continued to be universal. The piety of the fourth and fifth centuries, the religion of such men as Athanasius, Chrysostom, Basil, the Gregories, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, is conditioned from beginning to end by the conception of the church, as the necessary organ and medium of grace. Augustine in particular, over against the heresies of his time, became the great expositor and spokesman of the doctrine for his own and all following ages. With him, it remained no longer an article simply of faith and strong theological feeling. No one indeed had ever a deeper sense of its glorious significance, in this form. It lay at the foundation of his spiritual life. It formed the very hinge of his conversion. His whole Christian experience was pervaded by the power of it at every point. But what came to him in this way as a fact

of faith, he endeavored also to master in the way of knowledge ; and the result was, that the doctrine was brought to assume, through his wonderfully vigorous mind, a form of scientific consistency and completeness which it had not possessed before. This however was all. He added nothing, properly speaking, to the contents of the doctrine itself.

“ Most inwardly was he filled,” according to Professor Rothe, “ with the thought of the *exclusiveness* of the Catholic Church. In the painful struggles of his own religious history, the ideas of Christianity and the Catholic Church had become for his consciousness completely commensurate and identical. The hold, by which he saved himself from the shipwreck of his interior life, and on which he fastened spasmodically with the whole energy of his powerful spirit, was the absolute conviction that the Catholic Church, and this alone, was a historical revelation, in which the Christian spirit could express and actualize itself in a real way, by which it had a living powerful organism for its operation ; the consciousness in short of the specific and exclusive suitableness of the Catholic Church to the Christian life as its proper form.¹ He knew, that it was only by the Catholic Church, and in her, he had himself been able to lay hold of Christianity, that only in communion with her he had found Christian life, healing for his deeply unsettled nature and the satisfaction of all its wants. Before his mind the Catholic Church stood, as the compassionate and loving guide of man, otherwise helplessly abandoned to himself and his errors, with miserable desolation ; as the never failing fountain, out of which alone flowed for him the streams of Divine grace and life ; as the real communion of God on earth, in which alone was to be reached a true life of holy love ; and as the sheltering paternal home, where every one might find, according to his individual need, true care for his infirmities and failings, and a right field at the same time for his religious activity. All these impressions flowed together for him in the general thought—so familiar also already to Cyprian—of the *motherhood* of the Catholic Church, into which he poured the whole inwardness and tenderness of

¹ This consciousness is very beautifully and forcibly expressed, particularly in his tract *De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum*, L. I. §. 62–64, and in the passage *Contra Epistolam Manichaei*, §. 5, where he gives the grounds of his confidence in the truth and divinity of the Catholic Church. He says here expressly, that the feeling described in the text outweighs with him all single difficulties that might still remain for the understanding.—*Note by Rothe.*

his deep sensibility. This of itself expresses exclusiveness. Christ is to him altogether identical with the Catholic Church, his life with hers; and without communion with her he holds communion with him to be impossible.”¹

The universal authority of the doctrine, finally, meets us under the most impressive form in the ancient symbols or creeds. These differ in some particulars; but never so as to contradict one another; never so as to fall away in the least from the same fundamental scheme or type. This we have in what is known generally as the Apostles' Creed. Here the article of the church forms a special object of faith, which as such must be received of course in the character of a supernatural mystery. All the old church creeds acknowledge it in the same view. There can be no question moreover, but that the sense of the article was in full harmony always with what we have now found to be the doctrine held by the Fathers from the end of the first century on to the beginning of the fifth. We speak not of episcopacy, whether in the Anglican or in the Roman form; what we mean, is the idea of the church as a necessary constituent in the great fact of Christianity, as the Divinely established and exclusively valid form of its actualization in the world, as the real organ and medium of all its power for the salvation of men—an outward historical constitution in this view, which in the nature of the case must be in unity with itself, and to which men must submit by faith, in the spirit of little children, in order to be saved. Nothing less than this, we say, is the sense of the article, as it comes before us in the old creeds. Our modern thinking may give it another sense; may understand it to refer to an abstraction only, the notion of the so called invisible church; but in doing so it ceases to be historical altogether, and will be found in fact to occupy a different standpoint entirely from that of the ancient Christian world, over against the universal sense and spirit of these early creeds. The doctrine, or fact rather, of the holy catholic church, grows here out of the mystery of the incarnation, completing itself in the glorification of the Saviour and the mission of the Holy Ghost; it is a living concrete revelation, founded on the Apostolical commission, and carrying along with it corresponding heavenly powers; it defines itself, with inward necessity, as one, holy, universal, and exclusive, the all sufficient and the only ark of righteousness and salvation. It is a mystery thus for faith.

¹ Die Anf d. christl. Kirche, p. 680, 681.

Nothing can be more perfectly foreign from the genius of the old creeds, as well as from the religious life universally of the ancient church, than the notion of an experimental religion in the modern sectarian sense, which completes itself on the outside of the church, and without its help, and values this as a sort of outward machinery merely that may become auxiliary afterwards to the working of piety in the other view. From no such standpoint, we may depend upon it, is it possible to fathom the deep meaning of the Apostles' Creed. Every such standpoint is, in truth, the direct negation of the faith to which it gives utterance, contradicts in every position the mystery it was framed to assert and affirm. It holds this mystery for a lie, and sets up another notion altogether, the figment of natural reason simply, in its room and place; and so repeating the old symbol, pretends perhaps to be of one mind still, with this form of sound words originally delivered to the saints. Alas, for the delusion. There is however no excuse for any such mistake. The case is plain, for all who care to understand the truth. The doctrine of the Apostles' Creed in regard to the church, is the same that is presented to us by Irenaeus, by Cyprian, by Athanasius, by Augustine. We owe it both to antiquity and to ourselves, to see and acknowledge here the full truth. The voice of ecclesiastical history is clear. The structure of the creed itself, for one who has gained any true insight whatever into its constitution, is abundantly conclusive. What it affirms, as a foundation principle of faith, is the existence of the church under its outward historical form, as a Divine fact, as the supernatural carrying forward of the work of redemption, as the actual revelation and home of the Spirit, as the real medium of grace, in the bosom of which only, but there surely, may be wrought out the full process of man's salvation, from the remission of sins onward to the resurrection of the body and life everlasting. The church is made to be, without a figure, the organ of the new creation. There it is held to take place. There the heavenly forces on which it depends are considered to be all actually at hand. There the ministry, the bible, the sacraments carry with them a saving power, which can belong to them nowhere else. This is the very mystery, which gives the article its place in the creed. In what other view could it be an object of faith? How else could men be required to bow to its authority, as a necessary part of the mystery of godliness brought to pass by the Gospel?

In what wide contrast with all this old habit of thought much at least of our modern Protestantism stands, is too plain to re-

quire any sort of proof. The evidence of it is thrown in our way continually from all sides. Take in exemplification the following significant and characteristic passage, which happens to meet our eye while we write, as a passing editorial in a late number of the New York Observer, (July 28,) under the somewhat equivocal caption, *Tampering with the Truth*.

“ In the history of the rise and progress of the great apostacy, we have an illustration of the danger of the slightest deviations from fundamental truth. This giant system of iniquity may be traced to the early introduction of what, at first view, appears to be a slight error in doctrine. The apostle Paul informs us that, even in his day, the ‘mystery of iniquity’ was already at work. And almost up to the apostolic age, we may trace the specious error of sacramental grace, which lies at the foundation of that vast superstructure of spiritual tyranny, which, for ages, spread desolation over both the Eastern and Western churches. The difference between this, as at first taught, and the true doctrine, was apparently so slight that the minds of the multitude, not accustomed to discriminate, might not perceive it. A sacrament is an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, sealing the covenant relation of believers to God. But, according to this doctrine, grace is communicated to the soul in some mysterious manner, under the form of an outward rite. This is very agreeable to the carnal heart. It saves the necessity of the personal exercise of repentance and faith, relieves of the necessity of self-scrutiny, in order to discern the ‘inward spiritual grace,’ of which the sacrament is a sign, and turns the whole matter over to the priest.

“ This error, in its inception, was so specious, so much in harmony with the prevalent mystical philosophy, and so conformed to the taste of a superstitious age, that it was received by a declining church without suspicion. But there soon grew out of it the doctrine of *baptismal regeneration*. Then followed an increase of sacraments, in order to cover all the supposed wants of the human soul. *Confirmation* was made a sacrament to impart grace for *sanctification*; *Penance*, to secure the pardon of sins committed after baptism; the *Eucharist* was transformed into the real body and blood of Christ, to provide a ground of confidence for the superstitious multitude, without personal piety; and to this is added *extreme unction*, that dying grace may be imparted by anointing the five senses with holy oil. To crown the whole, there is the sacrament of *Orders*, which lays the foundation of the hierarchy, by imparting to the priest the power of conferring grace, in the administration of the sacraments.

“ Thus we have a complete perversion of the gospel, by the introduction of a *sacramental religion*, which removes the necessity

of an intelligent reception of the truth, and dispenses with faith, repentance, and holy obedience, and puts the whole affair into the hands of the priest, making his office indispensable to the right exercise of religion. Thus, the whole of Oriental and Papal Christendom lie at the feet of the Priesthood.

"The *germ* from which has grown up this deadly Bohon Upas tree, whose wide spreading branches overshadow the world, diffusing everywhere the malaria of spiritual death, was this same doctrine of *sacramental grace*, which some learned men in the Protestant churches are seeking to exhume from the catacombs of a past age, and impose upon the wonder-loving credulity of the nineteenth century. Though it must be obvious to the impartial student of history, that from the time of the introduction of this doctrine into the primitive churches, may be traced the gradual departure of the Holy Spirit; till at length the temple of Christ, deserted of his presence became the temple of idols, 'Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.'"

The quotation speaks for itself. It must be confessed too, that it represents well and fairly a large portion of the religious thinking of the present time. Our universal sect system is ready to take up the same key. This precisely is what multitudes mean by the conception of *evangelical religion*, as distinguished from what they hold to be a religion of rites and forms. Our object here is not to have any controversy with the scheme. Let it pass for what it is worth. What we wish is simply to bring into clear view, the relation in which it stands to what was supposed to be Christianity in the first ages. This all should be willing to see and understand, as a matter at least of simple history. It is the character of truth to love the light. What then, in the case before us, is the clear form of fact? Here is a theory of religion, claiming to be the true sense of Protestantism, which boldly repudiates as an apostacy and mystery of iniquity the whole sense of what Christianity was taken to be in the beginning, back at least to the very age next following that of the Apostles. To be on good terms with it, as the self-constituted exponent now of the true meaning of the bible over against the blundering ignorance of all past centuries, we are required to give up to Satan not only the church of the middle ages, but the church also of earlier times from the fifth century up to the very beginning of the second. For it is not with this or that questionable point only, that the issue of the N. Y. Observer is concerned. It goes at once to the very foundations of the ancient faith. The idea of a *sacramental religion*, we are told, overturns the Gospel. A ministry exercising in any true sense

Divine powers, is taken to be such a conception as opens the way at once for the full reign of Antichrist. Why? Only of course because the *Church*, the proper home of such a ministry and sacraments of such supernatural force, is not believed to be the grand and awfully solemn mystery which it was held to be in the beginning. All comes to this at last. The idea of a Divine church takes away all difficulty from the idea of sacramental grace, as well as from the idea of a ministry possessed of more than human powers; whereas the want of faith in the church under any such supernatural view, as being the form and medium of the Christian salvation in the world, necessarily involves the want of power to honor the ministry and the holy sacraments under any corresponding view. If the sense of a higher order of life in this form as something actual and real be not at hand, if the church itself be after all a natural constitution only, part of the system of this world in its natural form and nothing more, then indeed it is easy to see how all that belongs to it must sink down to the same region of mere naturalism, and how it must appear no better than miserable pedantry and affectation to think of talking it into any higher sense. Alexander Campbell's "baptismal regeneration," sundered from the idea of a real historical polity bearing along with it from age to age, by strict Apostolical succession, the more than human powers with which the church started in the beginning, is in truth a most pitiful and melancholy sham. And so to the judgment now before us all sacramental religion seems, just because it has no faith in the existence of any such church either now or in time past. But, as we have seen, this faith, right or wrong, enters into the universal Christianity of the first ages. It is not there by accident either or unseemly excrescence. We find it prominently inserted in the Creed. The piety of the second century, as well as that of the third and fourth, is based upon it, and constructed upon it, from beginning to end. The religion of the whole period was beyond all controversy just what is here denounced by the N. Y. Observer, as the complete perversion of the Gospel. The Fathers all believed in the Holy Catholic Church, and showed themselves to be in earnest with this faith, by ascribing to the church Divine functions and powers. If *this* be the grand apostacy, the "mystery of iniquity," they were all hopelessly involved in it from the very start, and the Creed itself becomes the "masterpiece of the Devil."

To this end it must indeed necessarily come, with Protestantism in the unchurchly and unsacramental form. The Puritan Recorder was only a fair exponent of the true inward sense of

the system, when it ventured to say openly some time ago, "that the Creed and Puritanism have not a kindred spirit," and that the life and spirit of the venerable formulary, notwithstanding the place allowed to it "by a sort of courtesy" in the New England Primer, "never entered into the life of the Puritan churches," so that it exists among them now only "as some fossil relic of by-gone ages." Every attempt to restore its buried authority, the Recorder views with pity and contempt. "We are free to confess," it tells us again, "that this Creed has forsaken the Puritans, and gone over to become the idol and strength of all branches of Anti-puritanism. And there are good reasons; for Puritanism builds on the Scriptures, and this Creed teaches, in several respects, anti-scriptural doctrines. It is true, that most of it is *capable of a sense* which harmonizes with the Scriptures, and so the Puritans received it, in *a sense consonant with their theology*—either leaving out, or putting a strained sense upon the passage, which asserts that Christ descended into hell. But it is neither safe nor expedient to receive such a document *in such a perverted sense*. For the document once being admitted, and its authority being made to bind the conscience, then the way is open for those who hold the *errors held by its authors*, to plead that we are bound to receive it *in the sense which its authors gave to it*, and this makes it an instrument of *corrupting the faith of the gospel*." Here we have the cloven foot disclosed without any sort of reserve. Some of the "heretical points" of the creed, as they are called, the Puritan Recorder went on afterwards to expose in form, namely, the descent to hades, the communion of saints, and the holy catholic church. This last it dared to brand as "*a figment*." But as we have just said, Puritanism is fairly expounded here by the unbelieving voice of the Recorder. It has never yet raised any protest against the disclosure thus made at its heavy expense; and we presume it will not do so in time to come. Its whole standpoint is theologically different from that of the primitive church. The faith of this last, as we have it in the creed, is not its faith. It has brought in, beyond all contradiction, *another gospel*; so that the question is now, which is to be regarded as apostolically right and true, the gospel of Puritanism as it rules New England, and much of the world besides in the nineteenth century, or the gospel in which the second century gloried and trusted as a Divine gift handed down from the first. The two systems are not the same. The platform of faith on which the one rests, is by the other openly disowned as unscriptural and contrary to truth.

Here is something surely, which well deserves our most solemn attention and consideration. We do not present it now for any purpose of controversy or debate. We do not pretend to condemn dogmatically in one direction, or to approve in another. What we wish, is merely to bring into view the historical fact, which must remain the same whatever construction we may put upon it, and which needs first of all to be distinctly perceived and acknowledged that it may be construed with intelligence in any way. Evangelical Puritanism, the modern sect system generally, is at war with what was considered to be Christianity in the first ages. The controversy between present and past here regards not simply the order of things in the Nicene period, and afterwards, but reaches up to the age next following that of the Apostles; and it has to do, not with a few accidents only of the old faith, but with its universal form and constitution. The question, in the last instance, is not of the Papacy as such, nor of Episcopacy, nor of Presbytery, nor of Sacramental Grace, nor of the authority of the Holy Scriptures. All falls back just to this: Has there ever been in the world such a Divine constitution as the Holy Catholic Church, in the sense of the ancient creeds? It is another question, which we need carefully to distinguish from this, whether there be any such Divine organization, with supernatural functions and powers, actually at hand in the world *now*. We may dispose of this second question afterwards as shall seem best; before it comes plainly the other: Was there *ever* any order of this sort in Christian history? Were the first ages right, or were they wrong, in making the existence of it an article of faith, and in grounding upon it the entire weight of the world's salvation? Here it is, that the chasm which yawns so fearfully between the past and the present comes fairly and fully into view. Puritanism does not believe, what was believed most firmly in the days of Ignatius and Polycarp, that the Church stood among men as an actual polity, created by Divine commission, and endowed with corresponding heavenly powers for its own ends. What was a foundation mystery of faith in the one case, is scouted as a dangerous unscriptural "figment" in the other. In this way, Puritanism breaks with the universal Christianity of the first ages; turns its *Creed* into a grand *Lie*; for all must go together, if any regard is to be had to the original sense of the symbol; and so literally converts the course of church history into a wholesale radical apostacy and delusion from the very start.

Such is the simple historical fact. Who will deny, that it is

full of unutterable solemnity and interest? Here is the question of questions surely at this time, for all who can rise above the paltry prejudices of party and sect, so as to take any interest in the truth for its own sake. Alas, that the number of such should be so few! Is the old church doctrine of the Apostles' Creed—or *was* it rather—fact or figment, a reality or a dream? Was it a true "heavenly vision" to which fathers, martyrs and saints, did well "not to be disobedient;" or must it be regarded, on the contrary, as the most melancholy hallucination that ever took possession of the human mind, the art of Satan playing himself off as an angel of light, the mystery of iniquity "leading captivity captive," in a new downward sense now, most horrible to think of, for at least fourteen hundred years? What are all other questions, with the everlasting din that is made about them in our Babel of sects, as compared with this?

Was there ever among men a *Church*, in the sense of the Creed, a Divine constitution, carrying in itself real grace as an order of existence *above nature*, and rightly challenging in such view the "obedience of faith?"

That is the first question. Only where it is answered in the affirmative, of course, can there be any room for the second; which *then*, however, cannot fail to come home with like awful solemnity—as a waking and not merely sleep-walking interest—to every mind that is seriously bent on being saved:

Is the mystery of a *Divine Church* in this old sense still at work in the world? Are the glorious things once spoken of Zion yet true and real, as they were held to be in the first ages? Or has that heavenly vision dissolved long since into thin air and mere Gnostic idealism, like the baseless fabric of a dream which leaves no wreck behind?

J. W. N.

ZWINGLI AS A COMMENTATOR.

The Sermon on the Mount.—Matthew—Chapter v.

THE Evangelist here furnishes an accurate report of the sermon of Christ; and this not summarily merely, as in other instances, but in a more complete form. In this sermon our Lord teaches how to mould, not the outer man only, but still more the inner. The exterior man is that which falls under the observation of the eye, and the outer senses, and can be apprehended by others. The interior however, which lies within, and is hidden from the eyes of men, cannot be thus apprehended. "No one hath known the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him" 1 Cor. 2. Do you say: How then does a man know himself, seeing that all lack the means of perfect self-knowledge. We do not say that any one fully knows himself, but affirm that the purposes, even of the worst man, may be unknown to others. When we say therefore, the interior man inspects itself, we speak of the inner man as it ought to be. Just as when we say, all fathers love their children, although there be many who neglect and hate their children; but we speak of those whose dispositions are rightly ordered. The exterior man therefore is that which shows itself in words and deeds; the interior that which is concealed from public view. Thus when we say, he speaks excellently concerning piety, but it does not seem to proceed from the heart. You here see a twofold man, and that in the same person. And just as the inner man is unknown to all others, so it is difficult to bring it to a proper knowledge of itself. Then first does it make a true discovery of itself when it lays itself open before God, who is the light which penetrates all things. If he examines and contemplates himself by this light he speedily discovers a den of iniquity within him, and abhors himself. He finds there pride, covetousness, envy, and selfishness. However much therefore the interior man conceals itself, and endeavors to lurk in secret, it discovers itself by certain marks to the pious and prudent; neither can its hypocrisy remain forever hidden. But if the external man so often deceives our judgment, why should it surprise us, that the interior man cannot be easily detected by us? For even when the disease breaks out, and affords some opportunity of discovering its presence, the symptoms may only be partial, so that its nature cannot be fully ascertained. But when man discovers and contemplates himself in the light of divine truth, he finds within him a hydra-den of evils. Neither

can any one hide himself from the face of God, nor draw near, without terror, to him who is infinitely holy and pure. For who can dwell with devouring flames? As fire rejects and casts off water thrown upon it, so the Divine purity rejects whatever is impure. In this sermon therefore Christ teaches us what belongs to the right cultivation of the inner man, and also what is required by the proper management of the outer man. He shows what affections should be cherished in the breast of man, if we would be pure and holy in the sight of God, what, at least, we should most zealously cultivate, as far as it may be possible for us to do in this mortal flesh. Thus he first declares: Blessed are the poor in spirit; which pertains to the inner man. Then he says: Let your light shine, ye are the salt of the earth, which are directions for the government of the outward man. Those precepts which pertain to the proper cultivation of the interior man, apply with equal force to all the children of God. What is said concerning the outward man should not be referred equally to all, for there are different offices and services in the ecclesiastical body. That we should be poor in spirit, therefore, is said to all, but not so when it is enjoined to be pungent like salt. For this constitutes the office of the apostles and prophets.

Aperiens os suum.—This is said by way of hypotyposis, or rhetorical description. By ascending the mountain, the superior excellence of that which he was about to teach is indicated.

Pauperes spiritu.—That is in heart or mind. It is possible for a person to be magnanimous, and yet have a modest mind, and be truly humble before God. When the angel smote the people with the plagues, David entreated that he might be punished in their stead, and his people saved. Was not this great modesty in so great a king? Paul was of a most humble spirit, and yet displayed great magnanimity. "I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ, for my brethren, my kinsmen, according to the flesh." May the nobles of our times reflect upon these things, who regard not the lives of the common people, but show their haughtiness and ferocity by words like these: Let the peasantry be killed, let them be hung; and who think no more of strangling a peasant, than they would of choking a cock. Then is the spirit truly humble, when in all it does, it seeks the glory of God and the good of others. Where this is not done, the heart is insolent, fierce, and proud. If we examine ourselves in the sight of God by this rule, how many more things will we find done by us from vain glory, or ambition, or some other like affection, than with true faith and a pure conscience!

Beati qui lugent.—The men of this world, seduced by carnal pleasures, break forth into laughter, and indulge in immoderate joy. But where faith in Christ flourishes moderation is maintained in all things, and nothing improper is allowed. Faith restrains the heart, does not permit the head to carry itself too high, does not give loose reins to lust, but with a firm bit checks and curbs the impetuosity of the flesh, lest it should run wildly onward in its course. For whoever examines himself by the light of divine truth, always finds occasion for self-condemnation, and reason for sadness and grief, so that he has no opportunity for immoderate merriment and laughter, and for indecorous exultations. The believer dies daily to these things, and endeavors daily to eradicate one or another of them. But meanwhile, this mourning of which Christ here speaks, is the source of the highest joy. Paul teaches, in his epistle to the Philippians, in what true Christian joy consists. For that entire epistle re-echoes with the voice of rejoicing. In these words therefore Christ rather consoles those who are afflicted and mourn, than recommends grief, as he elsewhere says: Ye weep and mourn now, but your grief shall be turned into gladness, &c.

Beati mites.—Meekness is opposed to insolence and audacity, just as compassion is opposed to cruelty. Meekness and compassion therefore differ. Audacity is impudent in everything, it is pugnacious, quarrelsome, contentious, clamorous, vociferous, and bloodthirsty, and does everything tumultuously and rashly. Meekness shrinks from everything of this sort, lest it should inflict or occasion pain to any one, or use violence towards any. It does not approve of insolence, nor protect the truth with injury. Is any one insolent and fierce in his bearing, he is not meek, but betrays the temper of a tyrant. The truly meek cannot endure to see violence and injury done to any one. They who do not withstand the cruel and insolent, nor condemn wickedness and vice, are not to be called meek but weak. And since these directions pertain (as was said) to the interior man, they do not exactly apply to the external duties of judges, magistrates, and ministers; for these must often be severe and strenuous, in executing the merited punishment of the wicked. But even they should maintain meekness of spirit, amid the severity of demeanor and language proper to the faithful discharge of their duty.

Possidebunt terram.—"Earth" might here to be understood Hebraically, as equivalent to the promised land. But we prefer to consider it as referring to the land of the living, that is eternal life.

Beati qui esuriunt et sitiunt justitiam.—Some one might say, if we be thus meek, iniquity will increase and flourish: To this secret objection the Saviour replies when He says: I do not desire you to be meek, so as to spare and cherish wickedness; but I call them happy who hunger and thirst after righteousness. They who suffer thirst, forthwith enter the city and inquire where they may obtain the best wine. But how slothful are we about seeking and subserving righteousness, even though we may sometimes desire and enact good laws, still no one cares to have them obeyed. Why is this? Because we have no thirst after righteousness. He who has truly this thirst, wishes that all may be just, asserts and vindicates righteousness, and, if any iniquity springs up, seeks boldly, with great diligence and severity to have it eradicated.

Saturabuntur.—They who vindicate righteousness, will be apt to kindle great animosity against themselves. They who resist the wicked, will probably excite the hatred of such against themselves. Wherefore the Lord comforts them and says: I will satisfy them. Here in this world already they shall be satisfied with what they long after, but still more in the world to come. And should not this satisfaction be desired by all, namely the delight of seeing and externally enjoying the highest and purest good? Do we not often feel a warm desire for the company and fellowship of a good man? How much more reasonable therefore that we should be inflamed with love for the most high and righteous God?

Beati misericordes.—This virtue consists in the exercise of kindness and beneficence towards the poor and wretched. This, we are assured, is most acceptable to God.

Beati mundo corde.—No one is perfectly innocent, no one absolutely pure in heart. But they have pure hearts, whose hearts are renewed by faith, and cleansed from the defilements of sin and vice, to whom iniquity is offensive, and who daily endeavor to amend their lives, cultivating truth, integrity, purity, and justice, and daily meditating upon these things. They keep their mouths from all filthy conversation, from detraction, raillery, and every impurity. The actions of such are fair and honest; their business, contracts, and dealings are free from fraud and deceit. Men of this sort are to be entrusted with important public functions.

Pacifici.—They are properly thus denominated, who are skillful in conciliating peace. Charity (saith Paul) thinketh no evil, and beareth all things. This virtue is opposed to envy and malice, and dismisses whatever might beget discord. But this

declaration of Christ is to be so received that it may agree with that other: I have not come to send peace but a sword. For the Spirit who speaks in Christ, nowhere contradicts himself. These two declarations therefore must be reconcileable with each other. Sometimes, when the sons of God desire to promote true peace, the wicked will not permit them, but excite animosity and malice against the truth. Whenever the truth is preached the world is thrown into commotion. The peace therefore which the pious are to effect, should be maintained within the limits which God has set for it; if these are transgressed, it can by no means be called peace. Some desire to be thought peaceful and pacific, although they connive at and flatter all manner of crime, however great, and permit vice to go unreprieved. But only then is our peace worthy to be called truly such, when it harmonizes with the peace of God. The peacemakers of Christ therefore may either confirm or disturb the peace of the world.

Beati qui persecutionem patiuntur propter justitiam.—A double promise is given to righteousness; for Christ has said above, Blessed are they who hunger and thirst, &c. Nothing is more needful and indispensable to human society than righteousness. Whatever evils and calamities are in the world proceed from this that we are unrighteous, and are willing to endure nothing for righteousness sake. They who seek to maintain righteousness, procure nothing from the world but hatred and death. Wherefore the Lord promises to such the kingdom of heaven, and calls them happy whom the world execrates as villains and wretches. Only we need to guard carefully against being guilty of the wickedness charged upon us. Then truly is a great and glorious reward promised to those who thus maintain righteousness, namely an eternal kingdom in the heavens, although he sometimes compensates them in this life already. He instances the prophets as defenders of righteousness, that we may see that such vindication belongs especially to the prophetic and apostolical offices, though it is required of all his disciples. Indeed persecution is the common temporal reward of all the good and just. Thus Christ consoles his followers, by predicting coming persecutions, if they diligently pursue their calling. Assuredly an arduous and difficult calling, which none but the foolish or wicked will rashly covet!

Vos estis sal terrae.—This we think applies properly to the apostolic office. By the use of a beautiful and familiar metaphor, Christ admonishes the apostles concerning their duties. References to salt are frequently found in proverbs. Salt was

formerly used in religious oblations, to typify that the prophetic office, whose teachings and exhortations were to be mixed with some severity, should expel and banish all wickedness. Salt is used for seasoning articles of food, and preserving them from worms and putrefaction. The salt of the Church is the word of God, which those entrusted with its management, must use in proper and needful measure. They who are negligent and indolent lack this element, and preach either for gain or to procure the means of gratifying their appetites; they are blind leaders, dumb dogs. A little salt will preserve a large quantity of food, and one prophet is often sufficient for a whole church, if only the salt is not wanting.

Vos estis lux mundi.—The wisdom of God often teaches and illustrates the same truth in various ways. Here Christ repeats what he had just said, only that he sets forth the truth still more clearly. These two precepts pertain primarily to the apostolic office, and regulate their external conduct; although at the same time they may be applied, to a certain extent, to all the children of God. We thus explain them: It was the function of the Apostles to go about the world and testify concerning Christ, to draw men from the world to Christ, and aid them in escaping from the darkness of death to the light of truth, from a course of sin, to a life of integrity and purity. To effect this their preaching must needs be severe and stringent, with a setting forth of truth biting as salt. This truth therefore they must hold forth, by word and conduct, as a light to the world. When this is done, the impious and wicked abhor the light of truth, turn from it, hate, persecute, and if possible, extinguish it. It is of little use to be sharp in our preaching, unless the life of the preacher is also lucid and pure. Hence I said, that these directions apply mainly to apostles and ministers of the Church, yet so that they may not improperly be accommodated to all its single members. Descending therefore from the literal, and (if I may say so) the ceremonial sense of these words, their internal and chief signification being meanwhile preserved, we shall find that they commend a virtue which all christians in common should exhibit. Publicly to preach, and perform apostolic functions is not binding upon all the faithful, Eph. iv, 1 Cor. xii. But to profess the truth, to oppose wickedness, and let the light of good works shine forth, pertains equally to all. Abraham pursued the kings with a collected band, and rescued his friend Lot. To aid in the deliverance and rescue of a brother is the privilege of all men, but to attack kings in a general war, is not the duty of all, but devolves upon the public magistrates. To

do good therefore to a brother, to assist as far as possible in rescuing him, is allowed to all Christians, provided care be taken not to transgress the proper limits of law and order. Scipio, a courageous and brave man, expelled Hannibal from Italy, after Carthage had been overthrown. We may not all possess the requisite qualities for such achievements; but to drive an enemy from our homes, is to do with fortitude and intrepidity whatever is obligatory upon us. Run thus in your thoughts through particular cases, carefully distinguishing between what is merely external and personal, and what is internal, rejecting the former and retaining the latter. The public office of preaching therefore belongs only to those appointed thereto, to let the light of truth shine is the duty of all. To be fearless and steadfast, in the defence of truth and justice is required of all; but not to preach and execute the laws. It is therefore not the duty of apostles only to profess the truth, though they especially are expected to do this. But, alas! for shame! we are so hoodwinked and blinded to falsehood and iniquity, we are so much terrified at darkness, that we embrace vice for virtue. There is no one who opposes himself as a wall of brass to the wicked, no one who steps forth in fearless vindication of the truth; none who kindles the bright torch of truth and light, and holds it intrepidly forth to view. What else then may we expect, under such a confederation of iniquity, but the avenging wrath of God! Let Sodom's doom admonish us!

Non potest oppidum abscondi supra montem situm.—Here the Saviour expresses almost the same sentiment by an equally elegant figure. It is not possible for a city built on an eminence, from whence it can be seen on every side, to carry on its affairs secretly or covetly. You, (says Christ), are like such a city, exposed to the gaze of all men. Let your holiness of life be manifest to all, then will they also be able to estimate your doctrine. And indeed you will not be able silently to hold or to conceal the truth which I have committed to you, if you embrace it with true faith.

Neque lucernam accendit, &c.—The whole world is buried in the deepest and densest darkness; there is need therefore that you light this lamp, and place it in the centre, instead of covering up the truth and conniving at iniquity. Should you do this latter, you would resemble a foolish man who should hide his lighted candle under a bushel. And yet how natural it is for those to do this, who wish to favor or flatter themselves in the indulgence of their darling sins. One thinks he may indulge in adultery, another considers it very honorable for him to be-

come a soldier for hire, and shed innocent blood. Preachers and teachers in the Church should seek to dispel this darkness. But with what weapon? With the word of truth, with the light of faith. If they conceal this truth, being frightened from duty by the fear of man, or undue regard for human favor, who can be worse, or who exert a more baneful influence than they!

Sic luceat lux vestra, ut videant opera.—But elsewhere He forbids their doing good so as to be seen of men. Divine wisdom however never contradicts itself. We are to live in such a manner that by the brightness of our good works, and the reputation of our virtues others may be attracted and inflamed with love for piety, our life must spread a pleasant fragrance around us. True, we are not to array ourselves with the glory of the good works which the grace of God may have wrought through us, nor to attribute to ourselves the praise, as the pharisees do. —Thus Paul says to his son Timothy, “Let no one despise thy youth,” which nevertheless (in one sense) Timothy could in no wise prevent: he means therefore to admonish him so to live as to afford no one a just occasion for such contempt. A virtuous life will confer glory. But such a life is not to be pursued for the sake of this glory, which, if acquired, is to be referred to the grace of God, the fountain of all goodness. Let your purity and faith be seen of men, that they may give praise to God the Father, who sent you unto them that you might thus gather them unto Him.

Non veni ut destruam legem, sed ut adimpleam.—Christ fulfilled the law. He did this in the first place, by complying with its outward injunctions, and submitting to all its ceremonial requirements, such as circumcision, &c. Secondly in this, that all things prefigured and predicted by the law concerning him were fulfilled in him. In the third place, by excelling in obedience to the precepts of the law, exactly according to the mind of the Lawgiver. For never did he vary in the least point from the will of God, who did no sin neither was guile found in his mouth. Finally, he fulfilled the law for us, that is he rendered satisfaction to the Divine justice, and bore the penalty which we had incurred by our violation of the law.

Quisquis fecerit et docuerit.—Christ exhorts his disciples to exemplify by works what they taught by word; even as he himself did. For although no one may attain to the perfection exhibited by Christ, yet each one should endeavor, according to the grace given him, and the measure of his ability, to copy after this great exemplar, and most diligently imitate Christ in all possible things. If indeed we are Christians, we should put

on Christ. They who think that a minister of the word should not declare the whole truth in public assemblies, nor reprove vice, would convert him into a piper, placed in the pulpit to play according to each one's pleasure and fancy. Thus only can he make himself acceptable and grateful to all. But it is not enough for the preacher to hold forth his doctrine truly ; we must be ready also to exemplify and practice the truth with intrepidity. Otherwise we shall resemble a fluteplayer who may perform correctly enough for the dance, but who plays for a company of old decrepit persons, unable, on account of bodily infirmity, to stir a foot or move a limb. But those who possess manly vigor, as soon as the flute is heard, leap forth and imitate its notes with measured steps, and that not carelessly or lazily, but with great alacrity and delight. We daily hear the truth, and are incited to purity of life ; but who exercises himself in the practice of truth and virtue ? But if all such proper personal effort is wanting, assuredly we have never yet truly and heartily resolved to amend our ways. Alas ! for our sluggish stupor !—By the kingdom of heaven, I here understand the Church.

Coelum et terra transibunt.—The comparison is equivalent to this : Sooner shall heaven, the most enduring element, pass away, than my word fail.

Nisi abundaverit justitia vestra.—Although this is primarily addressed to the apostles, they must necessarily be applicable to all believers. For when Christ taught that he should become great in the kingdom of heaven, who should do and teach, &c., there was danger that some would aspire to be considered the greatest, because he had in some small measure complied with this condition. Whilst all arrogate to themselves the names of the highest virtues, few may still be real Christians. Many there are, who are more anxious to seem to be, than really to be good. This hypocrisy Christ reproves, and says : Unless your righteousness exceeds the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, you cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. Who the Pharisees were, may be learned from Josephus. He calls the scribes such as were learned and skilled in the law. In German these learned Scribes are sometimes called *Schryber*.—In what their righteousness consisted, may be easily gathered from Matth. v : 15–23, and Luke vii : 11, &c. If we believe the testimony of Christ concerning them, they made every thing serve their vain glory, making the outside clean, that they might shine before men, whilst within they were most impure and full of filth. Christ on the contrary desires that his apostles, and all who wish

to be his disciples and members, should cultivate true piety and virtue, which consists not merely in externals, but has its habitation in the heart, so that they may be sincerely good, and not merely feign goodness. God requires the heart to be pure, and purged of evil affections: the external mien avails not, if the heart be depraved and vile. Christ proves this now by specific examples; and first by the workings of anger, which is an affection so common to all, that no one is wholly free of it. If any one manages this affection so that he merely feigns gentleness and mildness, he is chargeable with hypocrisy. He is the truly pious man, who curbs and checks the inward feeling of wrath, so that it may never harm or injure a fellow man. What is said concerning anger, may be understood as applying also to other affections.

Audistis quod dictum sit antiquis, Non occides.—Here the Lord treats more strictly of the interior man, penetrating the recesses of the human heart. This is not spoken of the judge who condemns to death according to law and justice, but of the private citizen, forbidding him to slay any one through anger. It is as though he had said: You have heard it said by the ancients, Thou shalt not kill! This is correctly and well said, if it be rightly understood. But it is not enough that you kill no one; whoever indulges wrath, violates the law. For the law requires more than the restraint of the hand, it forbids the affection, the anger itself. They who are angry, or betray their wrath by any act, or who under the influence of this emotion break forth into contumacious language, are not less guilty before God, than those who are convicted and condemned for murder before an earthly judge. They who kill are themselves slain by the executioners of the law, and lose their lives. Before the Supreme Judge, they who cherish anger, are thought worthy of eternal death; for God looketh to the heart. Whoever therefore bears wrath in his heart, is as guilty before God, nay more so, than he who commits murder in the presence of the magistrate. Not that Christ makes all sins equal, as some have falsely concluded from what he here says, as if the conception of hatred were in every sense as great a crime as murder. His purpose is to purge the heart, and stop the springs and veins of wickedness. For whoever resists sinful emotions, may easily shun the sins. But he who disregards these apparently small beginnings, may very readily fall into grievous crimes: by admitting the first movements of passion, he is in danger of being speedily swept away by its stronger current. For whence come thefts and murders? Are they not the fruit of excessive hatred

and wrath? Whoever therefore guards against these, will not be apt to spill human blood. There are doubtless grades in crime, and one is more grievous than another.—Christ therefore everywhere holds forth the most perfect examples of piety, which are to be most carefully copied and imitated by us. Such an example His own character affords. Be holy (he says) for I am holy. Also, be perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect. Meanwhile Christ knows our infirmity, and accommodating his exhortation to it, admonishes that if we cannot reach the highest perfection, nor keep clear of all sinful affections, we shall yet earnestly exert ourselves to do what we can, and to restrain our evil affections from overt sin. He will acknowledge them if they only succeed in these endeavors, even though they should not be entirely faultless, or perfectly obey the law. As if he should say: I know your infirmity, I know that you cannot prevent every wrong emotion, I know how impetuous is the force of anger; only take heed that the doors of your hearts are not thrown open wide for its admission. Or if it should gain entrance, labor lest it break out into actual deed and death. Altogether therefore Christ teaches three things: First he describes the highest perfection, viz: to exclude all angry emotions. But knowing this to be impossible, he tempers his admonitions to our infirmity, and lays down other precepts which impose a curb upon the violence of our affections, and restrain their actual outbursts. “If you cannot wholly keep yourselves from angry emotions, which I especially exhort you to do, guard against outward exhibitions thereof, and the utterance of passionate words. Or if your anger should impel you to this, still hold back your hand from violence and blood. Rather would I have you keep yourselves wholly guiltless, and free from every angry emotion, and my law demands this; for such disciples I desire to have and love. Nevertheless I will not cast you off if you should err through sudden surprise, provided you then recover yourselves and restrain your passion. Maintain moderation in all things. I know the power of sinful affections, I know how greatly they prevail, and how impotent men are against their assaults. To be insensible to all affections is the nature of a stone, not of flesh; but to moderate the affections, and firmly restrain them, to refuse serving so wicked a master, this is something worthy of my disciples. Those who have vowed to be mine, regulate all things by faith, neither will they transgress the limits it assigns, but attacking their evil affections with the weapons of faith, they at least save themselves from falling into more grievous iniquity, if they cannot maintain per-

fect purity. They who with boldness and impudence give loose reins to their affections, are destitute of faith, and unworthy to be numbered among my disciples."—But the third truth that Christ teaches is this: If, through my grace given you, you are enabled to keep your hand from the fatal blow, or even your tongue from maledictions and contumely, ascribe none of the credit to yourselves. Always consider that your heart is not free of guile, and that in the sight of God, you, who were conceived and born in sin, are wholly impure and deserving of eternal condemnation. He who restrains himself from shedding blood should not exalt himself over the wretched murderer, as though he himself were free of every fault; for in his own heart may lie concealed the same poison which, in the murderer's case, broke out into crime, that is anger. Let no one flatter himself therefore, because it has not burst forth in him. For if I had not restrained him by my grace, he might have sinned still more grievously. Not only he who strikes, but he who hates his neighbor is a murderer.—This doctrine of Christ therefore teaches us vigorously to oppose all evil affections, so that the godly, being influenced by faith and the Spirit of God, may prevent their more violent outbreaks, and keep them from transgressing all proper bounds. Next He teaches, that we should never applaud ourselves, or arrogate any thing to ourselves, or become proud, even though we shall remain free from more grievous sins; for there is no one who could endure the severer scrutiny of God, none whose life is faultless, none who fully exhibits the perfection He requires in his law. Christ therefore does not desire his apostles or other disciples to shine before others by any peculiarity of manner, or hypocritical pretensions, or to exhibit a haughty self-righteousness of life, but rather that they should endeavor to master their affections, and cultivate hearty sincerity; for the less such may succeed in their sincere endeavors, the more will they trust in the grace and mercy of God through Christ. This is true righteousness, for it is the righteousness of faith; and since hypocrites are destitute of this, Christ admonishes his disciples that they excel them in this respect.

Si obtuleris munus tuum etc.—This is stated in the way of an example: for the law concerning oblations and sacrifices was then in force. The choice proposed is between offering a sacrifice, or pardoning a brother who may have wronged us; and Christ teaches that in such a case it is more pleasing to God to forgive an injury and dismiss all anger against him, than to offer a sacrifice according to the law of Moses. I prefer, (says He),

charity towards your neighbors, to all the oblations you can offer.—And what he here teaches concerning oblations, may be understood of all external forms of worship.

Habeto benevolentiam cum adversario.—An adversary is one with whom we may have a litigation or action at law. This precept also has reference to the government of the external and internal man. Human affairs are uncertain and variable, and human judgments are often fallacious, so that he who supposes he has the better cause, may have sentence pronounced against him. Christ therefore would dissuade and deter his followers from all such strifes, deriving an argument against them from their perilous uncertainty: He, often, who has the most right on his side loses his cause, whereas he often prevails who merits punishment. By this however our Lord would dissuade them only from private contention and strife, not from the vindication of justice or the punishment of the wicked.—God has endowed man with affections and desires, which when excited by some suitable object, will agitate and burn like sulphur ignited by a flame, unless faith and the fear of God, restrain and moderate them. Faith therefore, like an ever watchful guard of the soul, and a careful guide of our life always admonishes thus: This is not lawful, or it is proper only to such an extent. Or it counsels the soul as the physician does his patient: This you may not eat, or of this only so much.—The first assaults of these evil affections are often so violent, that they can scarcely be repelled. They are however thus perverse, because we are all conceived and born in sin; the disease is hereditary, and therefore clings so tenaciously to our flesh. But God has given us his spirit and his word, so that if our natural affections at any time grow vehement and wild, we may control and moderate them according to the rule which He thus furnishes.—By this precept then Christ teaches us that we should be conciliatory and forgiving. And if the matter should be of so great importance that occasion of offence or danger to the church would spring out of such forgiveness, he exhorts them to consent to the plucking out of an eye, &c.—of which however more by and by.

Non committes adulterium.—In the preceding paragraph Christ illustrated his doctrine by a case setting forth the vehemence of anger. Here he exemplifies it by allusion to the equally violent affections of lust of the flesh and concupiscence. It is not enough not to defile your neighbor's wife, you are an adulterer if you look upon her with an immodest eye, if in your heart you lust after her; for adultery flows from the heart.

Hebreica is used for every kind of filthiness and impurity of the flesh. In a word, the doctrine of Christ every where tends to this, that evil affections are mortal sins in the sight of God, and that His law requires a heart that is pure and free from their stains. But the doctrine of the Pharisees taught men merely to order their outward conduct aright, and did not penetrate to the cleansing of the affections of the heart, affirming that the law was fully kept if a man did not actually defile his neighbor's wife, even though he should meanwhile indulge the passion in his heart. That this doctrine is wholly false Christ proves by various examples, saying: Do you suppose that no one criminalizes himself, who merely lusting, or looks impurely upon his neighbor's wife? Why he has already committed the sin, and rendered himself worthy of eternal death in the sight of God, by having thus taken the first steps towards its actual perpetration. Let no one therefore think himself innocent and pure, if he has not yet executed iniquity conceived and cherished in his heart. The fire of lust burns within him although it may be covered up, and kept from flaming out before the eyes of men. Before God it is as open as though it had been perpetrated, and it is not possible to conceal it.—Some one may now say, If the case stands thus, that a man is equally guilty whether he suppresses his evil passions, or permits them to break forth into overt sin, I will give them the reins, and enjoy the gratification of my desires.—Let that be far from you. For it is far easier to control and extinguish a fire that is burning within only, than when it has burst out and spread conflagration on every side. And yet that it is really fire in an incipient state, even though it be prevented from breaking out, no one of sane mind can deny. No one therefore will find occasion from the doctrine of Christ, for sinning boldly, or permitting himself to break out into more grievous iniquities. For He does not wish to teach, that he who indulges his sinful affections merely is as guilty as he who permits those affections to lead him to overt sins; but rather this, that not only he is a sinner who perpetrates the wicked deed, but he also who indulges in sinful affections, if sins are to be judged according to the strict measure of the justice and holiness of the Divine law. Hypocrites and Pharisees deceive themselves therefore in supposing and teaching that the law of God does not prohibit wrong affections but only sinful acts. God inspects the heart, if that is impure, outward conduct however fair in appearance is of no value.—Thus Christ shows us that we are all sinners, so that we may be humble, and not disdain our neighbor because he may have fallen into more

grievous sins than we, seeing that we all are guilty, and in need of grace.—From the few examples which Christ employs, it is easy to infer the depravity of other sinful affections.—You may pervert judgment for some trifling bribe, for cheese or venison; another does it for a thousand crowns; which is the greater sinner? Assuredly he who receives the larger bribe. But meanwhile you betray your liability to be overcome by wicked desires, upon whom so small a gift could exert so powerful an influence. Each one therefore sins in permitting himself to be corrupted by a bribe, and thereby evading the strict requirements of justice.

Quod si oculus tuus dexter etc.—By the use of an epanodon Christ returns to what he had previously said, and as it were qualifies the assertion then made: I said, that you should forgive an injury, and be easily persuaded to pardon offences. I wish you to understand me thus: if the wrong is so great that it affects the whole body, it is noway to be spared, but even an eye must be plucked out, or a hand or foot be cut off, so that the body may be saved from ruin. The eye is the preacher or bishop, the hand is the ruler, king or magistrate, the foot is the ordinary member of the church. Or it may be differently expounded, as we have shown in the 40th Art. of the Book of Articles of our faith.—The Anabaptists, by not observing these distinctions confound every thing, at one time affirming that a Christian should not fill a civil office, at another that the wicked should not be put out of the way. As if it were not better lawfully to dispatch the wicked, than to permit a Christian community to become a place of refuge for criminals, and all who violate the laws. Is then the church of Christ to be a den of thieves? To exercise such clemency towards all, however grossly they may offend, what were this else than to nourish and cherish every form of crime? To show mercy to none, on the other hand, would be equally unjust and pernicious. Either extreme must be deprecated. True faith chooses the proper medium, being indulgent where clemency is allowable, and exacting the penalty where it should be executed. They who discharge their office with true faith and charity, will not allow themselves rashly to err in these matters.—Does some one inquire, Who therefore should put out the eye? I answer, the Church, or the Magistrate who does not bear the sword in vain. For there is a twofold rod. With the one the Church strikes, namely by excommunication or separation. For the Church must cast out the refractory until they repent, Matth. 18, 1 Cor. 5. If any one amends his ways under the infliction of this rod, it is well, for the Church is content with repentance and amend-

ment. But those who despise this rod, and plunge into excessive crimes, must be restrained by the other severer rod, namely the civil sword. For these become so audacious that unless the fear of the sword restrain them, they are ready to perpetrate any enormity. These therefore are to be removed by the magistrate, to whom is committed this office for the punishment of the wicked, and the preservation and defence of the good. If this can be effected without the sword, let it be done, in the case of those namely who give promise of improvement; for others he must not bear the sword in vain. It is better to cut off a diseased and infected member, which cannot be cured, than to suffer the whole body to perish. The Church therefore should exclude the disorderly until they exhibit a change of mind and shew better fruit. If such clemency fails to profit them, it is the duty of the Christian magistrate to lay hold of them and punish them, so that innocence may be shielded against crime, and public peace and piety may be maintained.

Quicumque repudiaverit uxorem suam.—The Jews were accustomed upon the slightest occasion to put away their wives, that they might the more freely indulge their passions. Christ therefore imposes a check upon their intemperance. He restrains their passions, and sets limits which it is unlawful to transgress. Fornication or adultery however are specially named, not as though there were no other causes of divorce, or as though he would prescribe this alone, but for the purpose of stating one among many. For it is usual in the holy Scriptures to employ one example as a representative of all comprehended under that kind. Adultery therefore is not to be considered the only cause of divorce, although it is indeed the chief cause. For why should our Lord make an exception in favor of crimes which are as bad as or worse than adultery, such as treason, poisoning, murder, &c.? But that this method of employing one example for many is common in the Scriptures, will be manifest, to pass in silence over any other proof, from Deut. xix, where only one case of involuntary homicide is mentioned, namely when the axe, slipping from the hand accidentally inflicts a fatal wound upon a neighbor, in which case the homicide may have opportunity to escape to the appointed refuge. What if a stone or tile falling from the roof of a house, should, contrary to the will of him who may be refitting the house, fall upon and kill some one passing by? Or suppose such a misfortune should happen with a piece of wood or anything else? Was the place of refuge appointed by the Lord for him alone who unintentionally killed a man with an axe? Assuredly not; but only one case is stated

in the way of example, from which it is easy to infer the rest. By whatever weapon therefore one man might kill another involuntarily and without animosity, and under whatever circumstances such a misfortune might occur, the Lord intended there should be an asylum for him, although meanwhile but a single instrument is named. There are many ways in which such an accident might occur, and it is equally fatal if a man perishes with wood, as if he were killed with iron.

Ne juretis omnino.—From this the Anabaptists contend that all oaths are forbidden, and must be refused by Christians. But we can show certainly that this error arises from their ignorance of the language. For the German word *Schweeren*, to which they suppose the Greek *ἐπιορκεῖν*, and the Latin *jurare* to correspond, has quite another signification. For when we say in German, *der schwört*, he swears, it is uncertain whether it means he takes an oath, or blasphemes. The word is so indefinite that it may mean either. But the Latin *jurare* is used in a good sense, for taking a sacred oath, and for profane swearing *dejerare* is employed, which we express in German by *zuschweeren*, which properly squares with the Greek *ἐπιορκεῖν*. In Latin therefore there are three distinct words to express as many shades of thought, viz: *jurare*, *dejerare*, *pejerare*. The first signifies to affirm with an oath. The second to swear to any thing inconsiderately, whether true or false. The third to perjure one's self. Christ now does not forbid our taking a sacred oath, but only rash and frivolous swearing. The Anabaptists not seeing this difference, are willingly self-deceived. For Christ says—*οὐκ ἐπιορκεῖς*, that is *djeeres*, (for it is thus translated in ancient versions) where our translation has, *non perjurabis*, and not at all improperly; for whilst *perjurare* is never used in a good sense, it is not invariably used for taking a false oath, or falsifying, or speaking feignedly, but sometimes for frivolous profanity, (*dejerare*), i. e. when *dejerare* is used in a bad sense, which however we have observed is not always the case.—As to the words of Christ: “It hath been said by them of old time, thou shalt not forswear thyself,” you will not find such a prohibition of perjury either in Hebrew or Greek. But in Exodus xx, you may find, “Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God rashly,” or as our translation has it, *in vain*. Again Levit. xix, you have these words, “Thou shalt not swear falsely in my name;” where the Greek translation has it thus, *οὐκ ὀμνίσεις τῷ ὀνόματι μου ἐν ἁδίκῳ*, i. e. thou shalt not swear in my name to what is unjust or false; and the Latin version thus—*non perjurabis in nomine meo*. You can see therefore how elegantly D. Je-

rome uses *perjurare* for swearing falsely, not violating an oath. It was forbidden therefore among the ancients to take God's name in vain, that is, as is manifest from the passage in Leviticus, to swear to a falsehood. From this now it appears arose the opinion among the Jews, that if the name of God were adjured to the truth, there was no harm in it, although it might be done in daily and familiar conversation ; but to something trivial, foolish, false or feigned, it was not permitted them to take the name of the Lord. Then they drew another false notion from these scriptural prohibitions, viz : that they only forbid the abuse of the name of *God*, but otherwise permitted swearing by heaven, or earth, or other creatures, neither reckoned it a sin if any one used such expressions, if only he did not speak falsely. These vain and false notions now, derived from the letter of the law improperly apprehended, Christ, the interpreter of the law, endeavors to remove from their minds, teaching them that they should not swear in their ordinary conversation either truly or falsely, either by the name of God, nor by those things which God has made, but that they should always so speak and act, that if they would say *yea*, or *nay* every one would be sufficiently persuaded of their veracity. But concerning an official or formal oath, there is clearly no mention here. The whole matter therefore stands thus : You have heard that it was said by them of old time, thou shalt not forswear thyself or take an oath. But I ask where is it said ? There namely where not perjury is treated of, but the oath, it was allowed to invoke the name of God to the truth upon all occasions, which is the doctrine not of the divine law but of those who perverted it. It was said therefore among the ancients, not by God, but by those perverters of His law, who apprehended the spiritual law in a carnal way, and by others who interpreted it in a carnal sense. In Matthew it is added, " But render unto the Lord thy oaths." Whither does this lead if the former place (" Thou shalt not forswear thyself") is to be taken in the sense, " Thou shalt not violate thy oath ? It follows therefore that those oaths are meant here in which any one promises *rashly* within himself to do something, even though in itself proper or lawful, which he would be solemnly bound to do if he had made an oath unto the Lord to that effect, seeing that (as is added parenthetically) " Thou must perform unto the Lord thine oaths ;" in order that in this way persons may be deterred from swearing or adjuring, since there was danger that the Lord would hold them to their oath, even though it had been rashly taken. Then follows, " But I say unto you swear not at all." Mark then of what

kind of swearing he speaks, of that doubtless which the ancients supposed to be allowed them by their law, viz, to swear on ordinary occasions to some true and proper thing, by the name of God or something else. But Christ teaches them that in their common conversation they should neither swear, adjure, nor solemnly vow, in reference to any thing however true or worthy in itself. This view of His meaning is confirmed by what follows: "Neither by heaven, &c." From these examples it is manifest that Christ does not refer here to the formal or ceremonial oath. For what Hebrew ever thought of swearing in this formal manner, by heaven or earth, or any other creature? Who on the contrary was not daily accustomed to profane swearing by such things? It is this therefore that Christ forbids. This is the tenor of His whole discourse upon this point—"Let your communication be yea, &c." That is, if you would say yea, say simply yea, if nay, say simply nay. He speaks therefore of what should characterize their ordinary conversation, and not concerning the formal oath. And because this is not involved here, we add nothing further concerning it, having discussed it sufficiently in our Refutation of the Anabaptists, and there shown what is permitted to the Christian, and what pertains to godly piety. Christ therefore introduces nothing new into the law of His Father, but simply restores the ancient precept which had been made of no effect by human traditions. He forbids His followers to swear at all in the sense in which the ancients and pharisees allowed it; but He does not prohibit the taking of an oath according to the scriptures, for the glory of God, or the true advantage of others.

Quod ultra est, a malo est.—That is of the evil one, Satan. For in proportion as any one cultivates and loves the truth, will he become more like God. God is immutable, holy, infallible, pure, wherefore Christ calls Him the truth. By this interpretation of the law, Christ shows that we are evil, and that we are all sinners; for in God there can be no evil. So when he said above, "Whoso looketh on a woman, &c.," shows that evil is concealed in his heart. Wherever we perceive heat, we know the fire is not far off, and immediately apprehend a conflagration. But if the secret passions of others break forth into sinful acts, suffer not yours to do so. Flatter not yourself with self-complacent notions of your moral strength, but stand in the fear of God, watch and pray, that you fall not through temptation. There is, I confess, a difference between the passion and the act. The one sins in deed, the other only in feeling; but meanwhile this is a spark in the heart which upon occasion may break out

into a flame. The teaching of Christ therefore amounts to this, that we candidly acknowledge our diseases, deplore them, and seek their remedy, and never indulge too strong a sense of security. Mendacity is the beginning of all sins. By falsehoods the serpent seduced our first parents. If therefore truth is planted and preached, and spread throughout the earth, justice, righteousness and every virtue will flourish. The preacher therefore who has this light of truth, in his heart, hand and mouth, sets it up in the midst of the Church. Then the wicked and ungodly, convicted in their consciences, are put to shame, when they hear the truth so constantly proclaimed by the preacher, and iniquity denounced. This will occur whenever the minister is faithful in discharging his duty, seeking neither his glory nor temporal gain, but desirous only of promoting the glory of God, and the good of men.—And what I say of the preacher of the gospel, may also apply to the civil judge. Truth is august, and full of majesty and awe even for the wicked. Where faith flourishes in the heart, there the fervor of true charity also burns, and there will be a strong desire to promote truth, justice and righteousness. Truth assists the judgment (for it is light), so that it immediately and easily detects falsehood in others, especially if the whole life has studied nothing but truth and justice. Zeal for the truth always discovers with ease the true merits of a cause. For where God illumines, how can there be darkness? If truth is every where restored, justice will soon be restored, and directly every virtue will most beautifully and delightfully flourish.

Praebe ei et alteram.—This is a hyperbole, for Christ always adduces the most perfect examples. It has reference again to the internal man. We should bear injuries with patience, and be prepared indeed to bear even greater ones than those inflicted. The disciple of Christ must prepare himself, as long as he lives on earth, to endure with a noble and unruffled mind any evils that may befall him. For the world is prone to heap injuries upon the pious. Christ therefore admonishes us to imitate the Divine mind in this respect, although we may be unable fully to reach so perfect an example. This precept may aid us in our effort at self-knowledge, and the suppression of a revengeful spirit.

Diliges proximum, odio autem habebis inimicum.—This, so far as the letter is concerned, is found in the books of Moses concerning the extermination of the Canaanites and other gentile nations. As if Christ should say: “Thus indeed it was permitted by them of old times.” But if we contemplate the

divine and absolute perfection, it will be found far more proper and agreeable to the Divine nature not to revenge an injury, even though you may be wronged and have it in your power to retaliate. Christ every where teaches us to suppress sinful affections, and places the impurity of them before our eyes. Thus he reiterates the words of the law : if the desires are impure, and any one seeks his own advantage, he violates the law. They who only regard the letter of the law are not just. Do you ask : will I then be righteous and holy if I act according to the spirit of the law ? By no means. Christ treats us all as guilty according to his law, and shows that we are deservedly condemned. And however impossible it may be for us to keep the law perfectly, He does not therefore cease to prescribe a perfect law for us, even though we may not attain to its fulfilment. God is most perfect and holy, and therefore lays upon His people a most perfect and holy law, and requires of them the highest perfection, even though they may not be capable of fully attaining thereto. He therefore constantly sets the most perfect examples before us, so that we may the better learn our imperfections and impurity. Whenever the spirit of God dwells in the heart, man rejoices and delights in the law.—Artizans, painters, sculptors do the same thing, always proposing the best examples to their pupils for their imitation, which they are nevertheless rarely if ever able to equal ; but meanwhile they must study, and strive again and again. Thus Christ would lead us to a proper knowledge of ourselves, that we may know how unholy and impotent we are, and learn how far short we come of the Divine perfections, and never flatter ourselves with self-righteous conceits, never indulge our vanity, or suppose we are sufficiently holy, but ever live in the fear of God, watching, praying, and imploring help from the Lord. To effect this, obedience to a most perfect law is required of us, even though we should never succeed in perfectly keeping it. Hence come that grief and groaning, those tears and prayers, yea that despair of the pious on account of their own works and merits, their own righteousness. Thus we learn to trust to the divine mercy alone of Him who gave His Son to die for us. His righteousness is our righteousness, He perfectly fulfilled the law for us, He made satisfaction to the Father for us, and restored us again to His Father's favor. Thus Christ uses many words when He teaches us to forgive and love our fellowmen ; few on the contrary, when he speaks of inflicting punishment, and this because we are naturally more prone to retaliation and revenge, than to compassion and love. Wherefore we may also learn here that our eyes should not be

always directed to the mere letter of the law and its outer shell, but that we should rather consider its more perfect import. It often happens that a person may be acquitted by the law, who nevertheless is not guiltless before God, since the divine laws are appointed for the maintenance of external intercourse and peace in ways of which the pious do not always avail themselves, even if they might do so, preferring rather to yield their rights to the advantage of others, than insist upon them for their own. They forgive therefore even though the law might allow them to demand redress, &c. They consider the difference between divine and human justice.

Diligete inimicos vestros, nam si eos dilexeritis.—Christ does not by any means forbid here our recompensing those who may do us good, but simply that doing so cannot be claimed as an evidence of having attained to perfection. If you do nothing more towards those who benefit you than the ungodly and unbelievers do, you are still very far from perfect righteousness, and the nature of your heavenly Father, who does good even to the wicked.

Let us now sum up what has been said, in concluding this chapter. In the perfection of the law which God prescribes for us we see our spiritual impotency, imperfection and impurity as in a glass. For we may learn how wicked, on the one hand, are all hypocritical pretences of keeping the law, whether we make them for vain glory, gain, or under the influence of other evil affections, and on the other how condemnable it is to neglect and despise the law. At the best we are miserable sinners, even when we act under the incitements of the Divine Spirit, and in the exercise of faith; for our best works are always defective. For even though we may strive in true faith, we can never meet the full demands of so perfect a law. Our righteousness must therefore remain defective, imperfect, and impure, until by faith we apprehend and appropriate the righteousness of Christ.

Easton, Pa.

. J. H. A. B.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, AND THE BAPTISTIC QUESTION.

Translated from the German of Dr. Martensen.

II. INFANT BAPTISM.

WE have the conception of Infant Baptism in the relation of Baptism to faith, which has been developed in the previous Section. If faith be the fruit of baptism, then every baptism, whether performed on adults or children, is, in its conception, an infant baptism. If now, it can be shown that this apprehension of the relation of baptism to faith has its ground in the Scripture, then it is also shown that infant baptism is founded in Scripture. To ask any other scripture proof than this is an unhistorical demand. For it is of itself clear, that in that period when planting the church was the real mission, many things must needs have taken a different form, than in succeeding times, when the church had taken firm root in the world, and when the kingdom of God has become nature. Thus baptism, although its sacramental essence, and its fundamental relation to faith, must ever be the same, must come forward in another form when the kingdom of God is to be extended through missions—where it is introduced into the public mind from without—than where it is to be spread through the medium of an already existing *inhabitation*; where it inhabits the public mind, and is to unfold from within outwardly its world-transforming powers.

Where the kingdom of God is planted through missions, baptism must appear principally as adult baptism, because the existence of a mother church is the fundamental condition of a really blessed use of infant baptism. Since now the Holy Scriptures are written most directly from the missionary standpoint, where it was the more immediate mission of the apostles to establish the mother church, without which the baptism of infants, which is inseparable from Christian nurture, would have been a meaningless work, it cannot be reasonably asked that positive commands to baptize infants should be found in the Scriptures; still less so, since it is not merely the letter but the spirit which is to bring us to a correct understanding and use of the Divine institutions. The silence of the Scriptures in regard to infant baptism can therefore by no means set it aside, unless we deny all force to the spirit of the Scriptures, and go by the rule that not only all is true which is in the Scripture, but that nothing is true but what is contained in the letter of the Scrip-

ture. Without therefore seeking literal references to infant baptism, and appealing to such passages as Mark x: 14, 15, 1 Cor. vii: 14, 1 Cor. i: 16, &c., we will confine ourselves to the proof that the relation between baptism and faith, which we have developed in the previous section, is grounded in Scripture.

If now we consider the Saviour's own declarations in regard to baptism, we find the first in Matth. xxviii: 19-20. Here we find that the Lord gave to his disciples, in whom he himself had founded faith, and whom he had elected to plant faith in the world, the command: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." In the exposition of this passage we must repeat, what has often been remarked, that the common translation, Go ye and "teach" all nations, &c., is not entirely correct. That word, in the text, which has been translated "teach," has a far more comprehensive signification, viz: to "make them to disciples." To become disciples of Christ means not merely to receive his teachings, but to be personally united with him. Hence it is afterwards said in strict accordance with the original: "teaching" them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." If, now, we observe these words of Scripture it is evident, in the first place, that *all nations* are to be made into disciples. Since, according to this declaration, not merely small conventicles, but large national masses are to be disciplined, it plainly points out the universality of election in the most definite manner, and excludes all particularism. Secondly, it is plain also, that the general command to make disciples includes both baptizing and teaching, so that the church, if she will in all time remain faithful to the Lord's command, must, as the Saviour has done, place baptism first, teaching and the self-conscious life of faith second. This also the church has done from the beginning, but the complete realization of the Lord's command, even in reference to the outward form of baptism, can only find place where infant baptism is introduced. The more infant baptism becomes general in the world, the more completely will the words of the Lord be fulfilled, which commands that the *nations* shall be disciplined by baptism and teaching.

Again, we read in Mark xvi: 15-16: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that be-

¹ μαθητεύσατε.

² διδάσκοντες.

lieveth and is baptized shall be saved ; but he that believeth not shall be damned." This passage, which evidently lays chief stress upon faith, may in a superficial view, seem Baptist. If however we deduce from this passage the well-grounded proposition, that bare baptism does not save—yea, if we, in accordance with other declarations of Scripture, correctly teach that faith only saves, have we then contradicted what this and the previous passage plainly presupposes, namely, that baptism is that *means of grace* through which faith is at first truly established? No. On the contrary, the more livingly it is acknowledged, that salvation and damnation have their source in the depth of freedom, in faith and unbelief, so much the more significance has the question, How may weak and sinful man attain to saving faith?—so much more significance must be attached to that divine grace, through which Christ himself aids man to the attainment of faith. Hence, in the passage quoted, Christ says: Only faith, a free, deep giving up of ourselves, saves ; but no one can believe unless I myself give him faith. Therefore he does not merely say, He that *believeth*, but he that believeth and is *baptized* shall be saved. Of course, in those who are admitted to mission-baptism there must be present a preliminary receptivity, an inclination of the spirit towards Christ. This beginning of faith, however, is related to that which has its source in the institution of the Lord and the living fulness of the church, only like shadow to substance, like longing to fulfilment.

If we may gather from the Acts of the Apostles that the apostolical mission has in a certain sense made baptism to presuppose faith, the principal question still is how this faith was regarded by the Apostles. Apostolic baptism was not a forced baptism ; and a mission, for instance, like the well-known Saxon mission of Charles the Great, is without any apostolical ground. But just as little is apostolic baptism Baptist ; which is, in the history of the church, the opposite extreme of compulsory baptism. A glance at the apostolic practice shows conclusively, that the apostles regarded no one as regenerated before he was baptized, but that they demanded of those to be baptized only the general susceptibility, not a finished faith in the kingdom of God. The expression "believe," when it comes forward in Scripture in this connection, designates therefore rather the wish for, and the longing after, faith, than faith itself. Had the Apostles been Baptists, and had they regarded it as necessary that no one should be baptized unless he actually believed and was born again, their whole practice would have been different. How

entirely differently, from what we know was the case, would they have had to examine the applicants for baptism in all the most insignificant details? Were the Baptist theory, that baptism may only be granted to those already regenerated, correct, then the Apostles must be charged with unpardonable indiscretion, because they forthwith and without hesitation admitted whole hosts to baptism; whereas they should, with the utmost caution, have taken each one separately, instructed, prepared and proved him, in order to be fully convinced that he really stood in faith. For we are not warranted in making the Apostles heart searchers, and to suppose them to have had the supernatural gift of seeing into the souls of those individuals with whom they had to do, although the Baptists sometimes have recourse to this evasion. On the contrary, the apostolic practice is consistent on the principle which presupposes that the personal life of faith only begins truly by means of baptism, and that accordingly, as a preliminary to baptism, there is necessary only a general susceptibility for the kingdom of God. It is only under this supposition that the practice of the Apostles becomes intelligible, when they join the baptism, both of individuals and of whole masses, immediately with their awakening; whereas the Baptists, to be consistent, must defer baptism, until the evidence of regeneration is placed beyond all doubt.¹

If, as a final resort, the Baptist theory seeks to strengthen itself by such passages as Acts x: 44, where it is related that the Holy Spirit, *before* baptism, fell upon those who heard the word, we reply that that passage refers only to a general awakening, and not a real regeneration. The operations of the Spirit, which manifested themselves in this instance, consisted in this, that Pagans who were arrested by the apostolic preaching fell into an extatic condition, and spoke with tongues, a manifestation of spiritual conviction which was common in the apostolic age, and analogous to which much is exhibited in the periods of awakening which followed. This speaking with tongues was the expression of the mighty movings of spiritual powers in the depths of the soul, the streaming out of the first, as yet irregular, outbreking of spiritual energy, which had more the character of an exalted natural condition, than of clear conscious-

¹ Hoffman's "Baptism and Re-baptism." Luther already called attention to this point—to this deferring of baptism to an indefinite period, which re-baptism necessarily involves; so that baptism, strictly taken on the ground of this theory, can never be performed, because it can never arrive at an absolute certainty as to the condition of the subject.

ness, and which could therefore only attain to its true significance by passing over into the divinely constituted order of the church, and by being taken up into the historical process of evolution which characterizes God's kingdom. Had this extatic condition, in an isolated way, been adhered to, it would have manifested itself only in the promotion of confusion and fanaticism, as has been shown in every period of awakening, where religious nature-powers have not been brought under a churchly organization. Hence this special gift of the Spirit only reached its true significance through baptism, which the general gifts of grace presuppose—those gifts of grace which are to be continued in the church, and which belong to the sober and considerate historical life of the Christian; those, namely, of faith, and hope, and love.

If, farther, the Baptistic system would stay itself upon Rom. x: 17, that faith comes by hearing, it will be remembered that we have, in the previous section, treated in a general way of the sense in which that passage is to be taken. Here we remark more particularly, that the apostle in the determining context of the passage is considering the world-relation of the mission of Christianity, and in this connection understands by faith only the willing reception of the Gospel, which he places in contrast with that hardening rejection of it which he complains of as existing among the Jews. But the same Apostle, when he looks out upon the church in the process of development, clearly derives the beginning of the life of faith, the participation in the death and resurrection of Christ, from baptism; and sees, in baptism, a "laver of regeneration," and the revelation of the eternal love and mercy of God towards man, Rom. vi: 4, Col. iii: 4, 6. Further, where another apostle calls baptism "the answer of a good conscience toward God," 1 Pet. iii: 21, and the Baptistic system attempts to show from this that baptism is only a moral agreement between men and God, then let it be considered, that the whole context shows, that the apostle grounds the obligations of baptism in its promises, and that he considers it as the "answer of a good conscience," in so far only as he regards it, at the same time, as the "laver of regeneration," and attributes to it a "saving" significance.

Hence, if the apostolical mission, excludes the Baptistic theory of baptism, just as well as its opposite, compulsory baptism, then the peculiar substance of apostolic baptism must rest upon the peculiar relation between baptism and that receptivity, of which a compulsory mission makes no account, whilst the Baptistic System maintains its necessity in an unlimited way. If,

now, we say, that the receptivity, which apostolic baptism presupposes in adults, is, in its conception, none other than a receptivity for the kingdom of God which is already to be found in the child, the knowledge of this is not to be reached certainly by stopping in the fact of baptism, but only by descending into its interior nature. The more profoundly the church enters into the dogma of baptism, and thus into the biblical and Christian fundamental truths of the world and the kingdom of God, nature and grace, original sin and salvation, of the fall of our race in the first Adam, and its restoration in the second Adam, the more clearly will the perception come to a full consciousness that the baptism of adults, in its true conception, is an infant baptism. It lies in the Christian view of sin and redemption, as this has reached its classic development in Paul, Augustine, and Luther, that the opposition between the old and the new man, as it comes to view in baptism, is not merely a moral opposition, not the opposition of two processes of the development of moral freedom, but the opposition of two NATURES, unfolding themselves from two important grounds, which lie behind all development, and behind all moral life and action. Not single sinful actions of man are to be destroyed by baptism; but the possibility of all sinful actions, the sinfulness of the race, the depraved nature of man is to be broken by means of baptism, in order that his sinful nature may not be a hindrance to his salvation. And the new, which is to be brought into existence in baptism, is not a definite degree of holiness and of moral perfection, an implantation into the body of the new-created human race. In baptism, therefore, we are not most immediately concerned with the *person*, but with the *nature*; not with the finished *I*, but with the process of becoming, with the birth of an *I*; not with freedom, but with the active natural conditions of true freedom. In the other view, baptism must presuppose freedom as inward possibility, as receptivity for its gracious gifts. But the receptivity which baptism presupposes, is not a receptivity for this or that single gift of grace, which refers to one definite stage of conscious development: not a receptivity for one of the many special graces, which is bound down to one definite activity in the Christian communion-life. It is merely the general susceptibility for the new creation, and is therefore, in its conception, not yet an actual personal receptivity, because it has not yet specified itself as receptivity for any one special grace. The receptivity of which we speak is not the expression of a peculiar natural aptitude in the individual, which may lead to peculiar grace. It can only be considered as the general sus-

ceptibility of human *nature* for Christ; as its possibility of being redeemed and perfected in the direction of its destiny. And in this it differs from that receptivity which is presupposed in the Lord's Supper. The holy Supper is a believing reception and enjoyment of a personal communion with Christ; it establishes a real reciprocation between Christ and the believer. Baptism on the other hand is not reception of, but a divine *consecration* to faith. Therefore the receptivity which the holy Supper presupposes is one already specified and defined, since it is only found with such as have already attained a definite grade of the communion-life; and which seek, in the use of the sacrament, a strengthening of their personal life of faith, to the end that each one may be individually glorified in the love of Christ and of the church. But the receptivity, which is presupposed in baptism, can only be regarded as purely general, slumbering as yet in the personal peculiarity of the individual; and in this indefinite, twilight-like generality, it can only be comprehended negatively. First of all, it manifests itself in this, that the baptized one do not withstand or resist the grace; and we can here appropriately adopt the catholic formula: "*obicem non ponere.*" This, however, must not be regarded merely as dead careless passiveness, for no receptivity can be destitute of all activity. Although we cannot, of course, regard this activity as a personal one, which would confound the relation of the person to baptism with his relation to the holy Supper, we must nevertheless regard it as a *living* activity; and this active moment in the indefinite receptivity we designate as the "bent or bias to the kingdom of God," which constitutes the divine in human nature, but which can only be formed, unfolded into a personal *will*, and rendered truly ethical, in an actual communion with Christ and the Church. But that receptivity which thus belongs to or flows from the conception of baptism, is just the same which is found with the child. For just as the bent or bias of this world moves in the child from its birth, so also does the bent or inclination to the kingdom of God move in the nature of the infantile life; and as the human nature in the child is averted from God and diverted to the world, so does also that nature contain the dark earnest longing of the creature after Christ. In substance it is therefore also this receptivity which must be required in the adult subject of baptism, because it only, in this way, agrees with the true conception of baptism. But that receptivity which is originally in the child must first be waked up in the adult, which is done when his old world passes away, and he is brought to that point where he despairs of him-

VOL. IV.—NO. V. 31 •

self, and seeks a new foundation for his life. The adult subject of baptism cannot, in reference to redemption and the kingdom of God, appear as an independent personality; the steps of development in his moral life, to which he has attained, his acts and works, which he has accomplished in the civil communion-life of his nation, are, over against baptism, a vanishing quantity; for the reason, that the conceptions of duty and virtue, of communion-life and moral actings, only receive their true signification and importance where baptism has gone before—only have their true reality in Christ and the Church, in the kingdom of spiritual gifts. Since, therefore, he must thus look away from his actual personality, and forgetting that which is behind, must seek to begin his life anew, he places himself, in reference to redemption and the kingdom of God, upon a level with the child which is to be born into the new world of Christianity. Although he in reality differs from the child, yet his relation to baptism is in substance the same. This will become clear when we view the adult subject of baptism, not only from the stand-point of redemption, but also from the stand-point of sin. For, as he must be viewed in regard to grace or the idea of goodness, not according to his actual personality, but according to the possibility in him of attaining to a new personality; so also, in reference to sin, he must not judge himself according to his actual sins—which would be but a superficial view of sin—but he must go back to the origin of his sinful self-consciousness, to his Adamic nature, to his birth. The main problem of Christian missionary preaching must therefore be this, to bring the heathen or Jewish subject of baptism to such a consciousness of sin that it shall be possible for him to place himself on a level with the infant—a demand, which according to the teaching of Scripture, appeared already to Nicodemus such a great paradox, (John iii: 4) because he could not escape from his personal *I*, from his Scripture-wise, legal self-consciousness, from his acts and works,—because he has not as yet a correct idea of the sinfulness of the *race*, and consequently also no correct idea of the sinfulness of *his own nature*. This consciousness of the necessity of salvation gives, according to the principles of the apostolic mission, admission to baptism—a consciousness, which need not be present clearly in the thoughts of the subject; yea, which cannot even be so present, but which only makes itself valid practically in the form of feeling. Where now, the doctrine of general sinfulness, and of general salvation in Christ is gladly received, so that the hearers willingly permit themselves to be baptized, as we see it described in so many places in the Acts of

the Apostles, there the bent towards the kingdom of God has come to an actual issue, and the old self and the old world can not hinder baptism from becoming what, in its conception, it must become, an infant baptism. Since therefore the idea of infant baptism is always hovering before the Christian mission, it is plain that infant baptism stands most directly opposed both to Baptist and to compulsory baptism; because namely, both these forms of baptism in fact deny the identity of adult and infant baptism. Both extremes meet and agree in this, that they hold fast to the idea that in baptism they have a finished and definite personality—only with this difference that the Baptist theory regards this finished self (*Ich*) as a new man which has already attained to a definite stage of moral perfection; on the other hand the compulsory baptism regards this finished self as an old man, which has already established himself in the worldly consciousness, in which he has awakened, and now offers, a natural resistance to that which would drive him out of that position. Both mistake in this way, forgetting that not a finished self, but one beginning, a germinating self is to be baptized, or that the baptism of adults is an infant baptism: the Baptist theory, because it improperly *defers* baptism, and proposes only to baptize a full-born new man; the compulsory mission, because it makes too great *haste* with baptism, and seeks to baptize an old man rooted in heathenism or Judaism, without allowing to itself time to awaken in him that receptivity which sets aside the natural resistance of the heart, and makes it possible for him to receive the kingdom of God as a little child. Since both these extremes mistake the substance of baptism, they both become defective executors of the divine purpose; for while the Baptist theory, in baptism, attributes to human subjectivity such a significance, that it makes, in substance, baptism but an act of the individual freedom, instead of an act of Christ, the compulsory mission pays no respect whatever to individual freedom. It considers the persons to be baptized, not as subjects, but only as substrata for baptism; and while it accomplishes baptism with sword in hand, this baptism has so little the character of being the execution of a divine gracious election, that it comes upon the nations rather as a fate. The divine decree, therefore, receives its true execution, neither where baptism appears as a work of Baptist arbitrariness, nor yet where it appears as a work of fate; but only where creating grace lays the ground for human freedom. Freedom must therefore be presupposed in baptism; but since it is presupposed as that freedom which is yet to be established, it must be presupposed only as

possibility, as bias or inclination towards the kingdom of God. In virtue therefore of her doctrine of the universality of grace, the Church is justified, and it is her duty, to baptize children in every place where mother-churches are established, and it would be absurd to continue missionary baptism in the bosom of the Church, instead of turning it into the form of infant baptism.

Only when baptism is made to hold its place in its form of infant baptism, can the operations of baptism completely unfold themselves, since then the whole life can appear as a divine growth in Christ. The conception of *following Christ* only reaches its full signification through infant baptism. In order that the perfection of Christ may penetrate, with fructifying power, every natural stage in the history of human life, baptism must be conferred in the beginning of life. The direct antipode of this, is the error of deferring baptism to the end of life; an error, by the way, which is backed by distinguished authority, as Constantine the Great, the first Christian Emperor, gave it the force of his own example. This notion proceeds upon the supposition, that by deferring baptism to the farthest point, the subject may secure to himself a Christian, that is, a blessed death. It is not remembered, however, that a Christian death only attains its true significance through the Christian life which preceedes it. But the Christian life begins, according to the divine order, like Christ's own life, with infancy. In this, that the God-mann himself was a child, that he increased in wisdom and grace, that his whole life and actions were nothing else than the free development of the divine fulness which slumbered in the child—in this lies clearly the fact that the human nature may be united with the divine, not only at a certain stage of its conscious development, but in its inmost ground, *previous* to all consciousness. What the child Christ, is, in his original nature, that all the children of men are to become, by grace; and the childhood of Christ would have been useless, if it were not possible to change the Adamic infant nature into the image of the child Christ. To reject infant baptism, upon the ground that the period of infancy, on account of its innocence, does not need the Saviour, is Pelagian. This denies the universal depravity of human nature, and regards the infancy of Christ as redundant, and of no meaning, in the work of redemption. If, on the other hand, we take in earnest the dogma of sin and natural depravity, and yet nevertheless defer baptism until later life, because redemption cannot begin to work upon the child, and because it is supposed that its operations can only begin later in life—this is a Manichean conception of infancy; for, in this

case, a period of human life is designated, in which, although it is subject to the general defection of sin, it is, according to this conception, excluded from the system of redemption, and from the communion of Christ. In this way vanishes the heavenly glory from the infancy of Christ. The reality of the incarnation is denied, and we are carried back into the old heretical conception, that the divinity only then united itself with Christ, when self-conscious thoughts had arisen in his soul. It is therefore clear, that where infant baptism is denied, there also are the most important fundamental truths of Christianity, concerning the human and divine nature, denied. But where these truths have been in a living way appropriated; where, namely, a Christian family-life has been constituted, there also was the child, which was born in the bosom of the family, regarded as holy, (1 Cor. vii : 14); that is, not as one which is already holy by natural birth, but as one which is destined to become holy through baptism.

Lancaster, Pa.

H. H.

CHURCH SKEPTICISM.¹

WITH great propriety does the "Holy Catholic Church" follow the Trinity as an article of our faith in that wondrous mirror of Christian consciousness the Apostles' Creed. We might say with equal necessity also;² for without it there can be no proper faith in the incarnation as such, in which the whole mystery of the Trinity is involved and through which alone it has been revealed to the world; and Christianity, being by this means separated from the incarnation as its central ground, must lose all reality, or at least all *distinctive character*, becoming a religion of doctrine merely, and differing from Mohammedanism only in its more elevated tone of morality, or from Judaism only in its greater fulness of inspiration.

An *actualization* is as necessary on the one hand to that Christ-life which is revealed in the incarnation, as the incarnation is on the other to its revelation. Of course this Christ-life *was* completely actualized *in* its revelation; yet not in the sense of having gone forth as a living power, or as having actualized itself by bringing into its own organism the whole world which had become regenerated by it. The very assumption of fallen humanity upon the part of the *Word* was, in Christ's person, its redemption and regeneration; for he assumed it, not to sin with it, but to redeem it, and in this very act is centered the full redemptive power and efficacy of his person.³ So we can say,

¹ This article is part of a somewhat extended discussion, called forth originally by a private controversy; an explanation, which may serve to account particularly for the disproportionate length of the notes.

² Cum sub tribus et testatio fidei et sponsio salutis pignorentur, *necessario adjicitur Ecclesiae mentio*, quoniam ubi tres, id est, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Ecclesia, quae trium corpus est (Tertullian de Baptis. c. 6, as quoted by Bishop Pearson). In those symbols, where the Church does not immediately follow the third person of the Trinity, the separation is merely grammatical, and not essential, and generally in fact the Church is put at the conclusion ("*per sanctam Ecclesiam*," cum emphasi), only to show that all the previously mentioned supernatural gifts and powers are lodged in her constitution (see Pearson on the Creed, Art. IX).

³ This position is, in the main, we acknowledge, contradicted by J. D. Morell. We have Christianity in its objective phase defined by him in his "Philosophy of Religion" p. 123, as "that religion which rests upon the consciousness of the redemption of the world through Jesus Christ." Two conceptions, as the author himself acknowledges, are here brought into view, the one that of redemption, the other that of a *personal Redeemer* (what the author means by a *personal Redeemer* seems to be a single individual being, without any reference to the peculiar constitution of his per-

that in Him the redemption of the world is actualized, as its fall was in Adam; yet we do mean by this, that his personal life has gone forth into the world and actually Christianized every element of its life, but only, that in the incarnation we find the *realized possibility* of this historical process, and the absolute necessity of its actualization, as a *life power*, in the world. Indeed the very element of all life power is *concretion*, and every living process abhors a dualism as much as nature a vacuum. There is no such thing in the world of nature, mind, or spirit, as a *formless idea*, nor can there be properly speaking any such thing as an *idealess form*. Referring Christianity (as we shall hereafter show to be necessary) to the person of Christ for its distinctive character as life, we find that from its very nature it must take up organically into itself and completely redeem the life of the world. This constitutes in its *idea* the very *type* of its process, and the peculiar *plasticity* of its power. As the law of all growth is the development of a central point of evolution, in which the whole possible existence is contained, and the

son). Now, with a proper view of Christ's person, there is no possibility of separating the idea of redemption from a *personal Redeemer*. Here alone can it, in its complete universality, be reached. In the person of Christ only is that life lodged which is our redemption. Here not only the redeeming power, but the redemption itself centres * * * "ascendere in altitudinem offerentem et commendantem patri eum hominem, qui fuerat inventus, primitias resurrectionis hominis in semetipso faciens ("Iren. adv. Haer. Lib. iii. c. xxi). "I am the resurrection and the life." In me, not by me as a separate operation, the world, its whole process centering in generic humanity, is reconciled to God and by God. Holding this view, there is no possibility of conceiving with the author, that by referring Christianity for its distinctive character to the person of Christ, it would become merely a *form of religious worship*, introduced by Him without any necessary reference to the redemption of the world. This would be the case of course, were Christ as a *personal Redeemer* merely a man, a prophet like Moses, or a fabricator of religion like Mohammed, or a second Adam only. But there is far deeper significance in his person than all this. In him generic fallen humanity is already Christianized and redeemed, and out of his person there can be no redemption whatever, and also no proper humanity. As the incarnation implies, he is the concrete God-man, and in this concretion, and no where else rests the very conception of Christianity. Lutheranism, for example, may be simply the peculiar doctrines of Luther, as far impersonated as possible and reduced to practice; but Christianity is connected in no such way to Christ. As Coleridge aptly remarks somewhere in his *Aids to Reflection*, "we do not believe Christ, but believe in Christ;" that is, we do not follow the doctrines of Christ as our leader, but partake of him. "I in you, and you in me," is the Saviour's language. Christianity is *his life*, not what he taught or did in his life, but the Christ-life itself. Not our life of faith, but the life of our faith—its appropriated contents.

whole form prefigured, so Christianity, as historical and evolving itself from Christ's person, can never go out of or beyond that person as constituting its life giving and normative ground.* As humanity can never cease to be Adamic, so neither can Christianity cease to be Christly. If then Christianity thus receives its character from Christ's person, it must of necessity bear along in its constitution his personal life, and that personal life from the very fact of the incarnation, as we shall endeavor to show, must organically take up into itself the life of the world.

• Indeed were there no such organic process of actualization, commencing with the person of Christ as its ground and starting point, the incarnation would evidently be shorn of all true significance and force, and by ceasing to be continuous would become a plain contradiction, as its own nature is the sure evidence of its continuity. It is absurd, for example, to believe in an *incarnation*, and at the same time imagine that it can resolve itself into an *excarnation*, and become either pure spirit or pure nature. There is no necessity at all for forcing our faith so far out of itself, as to make us believe that Christ operates with only *ex-officio* power and in *ex-officio* style, or that he now stands far aloof from the world, having torn himself asunder from that humanity with which he once entered into organic union. The incarnation, to give it any reality, must have entered with all its peculiar organizing force into the very life-constitution of the world, as a permanent fact; permanent, yet not inactive, as an event or phenomenon recorded and thence remembered; but permanent *in its activity*, that is, ever moving forward with all the life-unfolding energies of an idea, and never ceasing its process or operation until the conception upon which it rests is fully and historically realized. Now in as much as its own force rests upon the organic union of the human and divine, its history of course must be the development and revelation of its power in the same organic way; not bringing us into God however, so as to make us Christ (*πᾶν Χριστός*), but bringing us into Christ's personal life, so that Christianity may fully complete and realize humanity, and God in Christ reconcile the world unto himself (*Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων*⁵ *εαυτῷ* 2 Cor. v: 19), thus making us Christ's (*πάντες ἐν ἐν Χριστῷ*) and thereby God's (*ἡμεῖς δὲ Χρισ-*

* In this sense we have used the word *idea*, and more in accordance with its proper meaning we think.

⁵ *κατα-αλλας*.—The prepositional prefix, and the verbal termination also, render this word very emphatic—a thorough change.

του Χριστος δι' Θεου 1 Cor. iii : 28). This being the case, it is plain that the Church, as this process of actualization, perfect and complete in the person of Christ, and thence going forth as the power of his personal and supernatural life (Ο γαρ αριος του Θεου εστιν ο καταβαινων του ουρανου και ζων διδους τω κοσμο John vi : 33),⁶ and completing itself in history by incorporating into its own constitution the life of the world, (John xv : 3-5), that life centering in humanity, and there elevated to consciousness; it is plain, we say, that the Church, as thus embodying the vast organic movement of the universe (καθ' ὅλην) toward Christ,⁷ is as absolutely necessary to a proper faith in the incarnation on the one hand, as the incarnation is to its existence on the other. They are inseparably linked together,⁸ Their connection is vital and organic. Form and contents, body and soul, inter-

⁶ We find here, and indeed throughout this whole gospel, that the true relation between the life of humanity, which is the life of the world, and that of Christ, is that of an organic incorporation of the former by and in that of the latter. Coalescence and incorporation are the terms which Calvin ever employs, in this connection.

⁷ εις οικονομiam του πληρωματος των καιρων ανακεφαλαιωσθαι τα παντα εν τω Χριστω τα τε εν τοις ουρανοις και τα επι της γης (Eph. i : 10). This is a brief, yet clear and powerful, exposition of the Church's process and destiny. She is considered as containing in herself all history. The law of her progress is the *home-law* (οικονομια) of the full realization of all tendencies (του πληρωματος των καιρων). In her inward constitution all things (τα παντα with the article more properly the whole, the *universe*) are reconciled to God in Christ. Here all previous tendencies are *recapitulated, unified, substantiated* and *realized*. Here the world is freely and organically taken up into Christ's life—born again by the Spirit into the resurrection life of Christ; who, in his own resurrection, was the first fruits of man's resurrection. The history of the Church is thus made the history of history, the central ground whence all other processes take their position and significance. She records not the events of the world's separate life, but the very birth travails of her regeneration to a new life, and the truth revealings of her new awakened and ever widening consciousness. Irenaeus writes very forcibly in reference to this recapitulatory process: "Unus igitur Deus Pater quemadmodum ostendimus et unus Christus Jesus Dominus noster veniens per universam dispositionem et omnia in semetipso recapitulans in omnibus autem est, et homo plasmatio Dei, et hominem ergo in semetipso recapitulatus est, invisibilis visibilis factus, et incomprehensibilis factus comprehensibilis, et impassibilis passibilis, et verbum homo, universa in semetipsum recapitulans, uti sicut in supercoelestibus et spiritualibus et in visibilibus et corporalibus principatum habeat in semetipsum primatum assumens et apponens semetipsum apto in tempore" (Iren. adv. Haer. Lib. iii. c. xxiii). Calvin also: "denique sine Christo totus mundus est quasi deforme chaos et horrenda confusio. Solus ipse nos colligit in veram unitatem" (Calv. Com. on New Tes.).

⁸ ωπερ ουκ αν η Χριστος Ιησους εκει η καθολικη εκκλησια (Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. c. 8).

penetrate and live in each other, and the Church is thus the living actual embodiment of the incarnate mystery. Divide them, and the incarnation becomes a merely transient phenomenon, with no permanent or continuous force for the world or man; and the church, instead of being the body and fulness of Christ, proves itself but a lifeless empty corpse. If the life-power of Christ's person does not enter into the very constitution of the Church, it is of no efficacy to the world. If his life-blood does not circulate through her every artery and vein, it becomes stagnant and destitute of all vivific power for his people. If the Church, as the mother of us all, has no living wedlock with Christ,⁹ we are but bastard sons and daughters, with no legitimate prospect of the inheritance. Hence we say that the church with equal propriety and necessity follows the incarnation as an article of our faith in the Creed.

Mysterious in her constitution, which is leavened with the active power of Christ's incorruptible and supernatural life, her nature and mission can only be perceived and felt by faith. *God* must be in *Christ* reconciling the world unto himself by the *Holy Ghost*, in the *Church*, which is Christ's body, in which we are united in the closest *communion* as members of each other and of him from whom we thus receive full *forgiveness* in our complete *at-one-ment*, and that life which is our *resurrection* and our *everlasting life*.

This leads us to examine somewhat more closely, before discussing the nature of the Church, the doctrine of the incarnation, holding as it does such a central position in that "regula fidei," the substance of which we have just given. We shall do this first in a historical way, showing how it has been apprehended and established by the early Church.¹⁰ Our point here, is not to determine what may be termed the ground of the incarnation, involved in the question "Cur Deus Homo," but only to show that its full force as real and redemptive, and as apprehended by the Church, rests upon the peculiar constitution of Christ's person as the organic union of the human and divine. In this union we shall endeavor to find that central point of evolution, which is essentially necessary to constitute Christiani-

⁹ καὶ συνταί οἱ δύο εἰς σὰρκα μίαν (Ephes. v. 31-32).

¹⁰ There would be no necessity of pursuing this course, did not both the modern Arian and Gnostic spirit ostensibly parade the christology and church-thought of this period in its favor; in a manner entirely inconsistent and unjust however, and without at all recognizing their true force and consequence.

ty a single organic life-process. This position in itself is by no means chargeable with heresy; for what we have said already will guard against the supposition, that we support such a synthesis of the two natures that in the *composite nature* they lose their *distinctive character*. There is no composite nature in the case whatever, neither can there be.¹¹ As in Christianity, humanity loses not its own nature, but on the contrary finds its own proper idea realized; so it is not the *nature* of Christ, whether human or divine, or both, which is operative, but his *personal life*. He sustains a different relation to the race in this respect than the first Adam. He is humanity's *quickening spirit*, not its *nature-giving* but its *life-giving* power. The human and divine must be *distinctly* present, it is true, in the constitution of his person, before he can be the resurrection and the life of the world; yet being distinctly present so as not to form a synthetic or composite φύσις by no means destroys the possibility of a single υποστάσις.¹² There is indeed an absolute necessity of some central ground of union, some ενωσις in Christ's person, or the *incarnation* is nothing more than an *inspiration* and the personal I of Christ a falsehood. Christ must be a concrete God-man, or the world's redemption remain a problem as yet unsolved, and all history a *nisus* as yet without aim or revelation. This new single Christ υποστάσις, which proves itself to have been necessary, differs from that of the Father, the Holy Ghost, or man,¹³ and introduces into the world by virtue of its nature an entirely new and distinct order of life of which it is itself of course the source and type. This, as we have said, the incarnation implies and renders necessary as being itself the direct introduction of new supernatural and permanent forces into the

¹¹ Ατρεπτως γὰρ καὶ ἀναλλοιωτῶς ἠνωθῆσαν ἀλλήλαις αἱ φύσεις μὴτε τῆς θείας φύσεως ἐκστάσεως τῆς οἰκίας ἀπλοτήτος, μὴτε μὴν τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἢ τραχείας εἰς θεογήτος φύσιν ἢ εἰς ἀνυπαρξίαν χωρησάσης, μὴτε ἐκ τῶν δύο μίας γεγεννημένης συνθετοῦ φύσεως, ἢ δὲ συνθετοῦ φύσις οὐδ' ὅποτε τῶν ἐξ ὧν συνετέθη φύσεων ὁμοούσιος ὑπαρχειν δύναται (Damas. de Orth. Fid. Lib. iii. cap. iii Basileae, 1548). This was clearly established by the council of Chalcedon, over against the Eutychian heresy, six hundred and thirty fathers being present.

¹² ἐντεθεν οὐκ ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν μίαν φύσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος συγχειμένου, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ Θεότητος καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος . . . but the union is κατὰ συνθεσιν, ἡγούσιν καθ' υποστάσιν ἀτρεπτως καὶ ἀσυγχύτως καὶ ἀναλλοιωτῶς καὶ ἀδιαιρετῶς καὶ ἀδιάστατῶς, καὶ ἐν δύοσι φύσεσι τελειῶς ἐχούσαις μίαν υποστάσιν (Damas. de. Orth. Fid. Lib. iii, cap iii). This was established by the council of Ephesus over against the Nestorian heresy.

¹³ συνακτύνται γὰρ αἱ φύσεις αὐτοῦ τῇ υποστάσει μίαν υποστάσιν συνθετὴν ἔχουσαι καθ' ἣν διαφέρει τοῦ τε πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς τε μητρὸς καὶ ἡμῶν (Dam. de. Orth. Fid. p. 134).

constitution of the world's life ; and there seems to have been also an adaptation if not necessity both on the part of God and man for it.¹⁴

Before entering, however, into an examination of the doctrine of the incarnation as held by the early Church, it may be proper to show by a few remarks that the subject is by no means important in a speculative way only, but pregnant with practical application and force. All christological research it is true must be based upon the declaration of the Apostle : " Great is the mystery of Godliness—God manifest in the flesh ;" and therefore however close and severe such research may be, it can never exhaust the mystery which lies at its foundation. But this is the case with all the articles of our faith. Their region is the spiritual and supernatural world, unto which we have no access by reason or sense, but by faith alone. This however does not rob them of worth or importance, but rather gives to them deeper significance and reality ; for they address themselves immediately to the deepest ground of our being. As Leighton beautifully remarks : " Faith elevates the soul not only above sense and sensible things, but above reason itself," and humanity is in its most perfect state of realization when it thus dwells and lives in supernatural realities—amidst *mysterious sacramental* truths. The charge of mystery is very common at the present day, especially in reference to all inquiries into the nature of Christ and his Church. But there cannot well be a charge more inconsistent and absurd. The end of all knowledge, as well as its primary ground, must be mystery ; for its process can never cease until it reaches that which is groundless.¹⁵ If at any stage of its progress it can define the position which it has reached, that definition becomes a ground back of the position itself ; and knowledge can never be said to be complete until it reaches the

¹⁴ We cannot forbear quoting Novatian upon this point, as we shall have occasion to refer to him hereafter. In his work de Trinitate, cap. xxiii, he writes : " Quoniam si ad hominem veniebat ut mediator Dei et hominum esse deberet, oportuit illum cum eo esse et verbum carnem fieri ut in semetipso concordiam confibularet terrenorum pariter atque coelestium, dum utriusque partis in se connectens pignora et Deum homini et hominem Deo copularet, ut merito Filius Dei per assumptionem Carnis Filius hominis, et Filius hominis per receptionem Dei Verbi Filius Dei effici possit. Hoc altissimum atque reconditum sacramentum ad salutem generis humani ante saecula destinatum in Domino Jesu Christo Deo et homini invenitur impleri, quo conditio generis humani ad fructum aeternae salutis posset adduci" (Patrologiae Cursus Comp. Tom. iii. p. 992).

¹⁵ Coleridge has a similar thought in his " Aids to Reflection."

ultimate ground, which from the nature of the case must be a mystery, a true *sacrament* to the mind. Every rational research must start in this acknowledgment; for there is no possibility of going from nature up to God through purely natural means. Every natural faculty is firmly fixed in earth, though pointing to heaven; and our communion with the supernatural must be by the exercise of that which is *itself* supernatural. If knowledge then be based upon that which is beyond itself, we are not to disregard its claim upon our attention; for its basis is only mysterious, because it is *absolute and real*. The same is the case with every possible department of human activity. In philosophy, the highest sphere of thought, we have the same necessary limitation. *It* can never pass beyond the Church's consciousness of Christ's person. This must ever be the measure of its truth and progress; for its ultimate aim is to reach the true relation and reconciliation of the finite and infinite, and here only can this relation and reconciliation be reached. "Christ is the truth."¹⁶ Wherever you commence, every thing earthly points to the heavenly. The world gathered up in humanity has ever hungered for that bread which was to give it life, and in every act of its existence has manifested its longings for supernatural aid. Even the whole choir of heaven, earth and hades, proclaim with one accord, that the incarnation is the great mystery, the central sacrament of the universe. The whole history of the ante-christian world, taking into its constitution Paganism as well as Judaism, tended to this very point; not indeed as the *result* of its own tendencies, or the fruit of its own process, but as the introduction of a new life and dispensation from above, responding however in every respect to the deepest wants and absolute necessities of the race. The Word became flesh, and not vice versa, although Judaism with its law and prophecy, and Paganism with its plastic polythism and refined culture, were clearly preparatory to it. All Christian history also, (we cannot say post-christian, for with much significance time is now reckoned Anno Domini, and not Anno post Dominum,) receives its meaning only in the conscious reception on the part of the world of the Christ-life of the incarnation. This is the animating soul of all history and development.

¹⁶ There is no possibility of separating philosophy from revelation in this sense. Christ is the way through which alone we can enter the infinite world of spirit. He is the truth also, as having reconciled being and phenomena, by completely uniting in himself the finite and infinite, so that the world of nature also is interpreted by Him.

If then we are to find in the incarnation, the character-giving and the life-giving type of all processes; if here the *history* of philosophy must stop her progress, and if found contradictory retrace her steps, and by the glorious light of this revelation correct her error; if here also the *philosophy* of history must finally rest in its full realization, when the heavens and the earth shall become new, why fix the sneering title of mysterious speculative theorizing upon all attempts to *consciously* pass along in the economy of God, or why with stopped ears and blinded eyes foolishly not listen to the voice of both heaven and earth announcing and pronouncing in every syllable they utter, along the track of ages, the *Word of God*, or refuse to look even through a glass darkly at that sun of righteousness, which lighteth the world. Faith, of course, must precede knowledge in this case, as in every other; yet not in the sense of emptying knowledge of its contents, but of elevating it into its own region of clearer intuition. As apprehended by faith, the mystery of the incarnation must ever remain the same; for its revelation is *in us* and not *to us*; but when applied to bring out more clearly the true nature of Christianity and the Church, great differences arise, and often although perhaps unconsciously its central force is pushed out of view and even utterly disregarded. Just here shall we find that the two roads divide, the one leading in the way of Church skepticism, the other in the way of Church faith; the one acknowledging no permanent force in the incarnation, and hence no supernatural powers or life in the Church, the other on the contrary recognizing her as the living and actual embodiment of this life, and the only continuation of this force.

Thus the doctrine of the incarnation becomes of great importance as a test in reference to Church orthodoxy, and therefore of vast influence upon all the practical operations of Christianity; for only so far as we can recognize the living connection between the incarnation and the Church, can we enter into the mysterious depth of Christian faith, or feel the powers of the life to come, operating within us and around us.

We should do great injustice to the subject in hand, were we not to mention the great practical importance which was attached to a correct view of Christ's person by the early Church. Upon this point she was peculiarly sensitive, and in the extreme caution with which she moved, as well as in the truly wonderful power with which she assimilated and took into her life that which was congenial and rejected that which was foreign, we have the clearest evidence of the divinity of her constitution, and the organizing and conserving power of the life she bears.

From the very earliest age of her existence, onward through persecutions, martyrdoms and triumphs, up to the Councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, Christ's person continued to be almost the sole test of heresy and orthodoxy. Saint Ignatius, as well as his divinely inspired master Saint John, makes mention of it always in this way. In his Epistle to the Ephesians, he calls those who carry about the name of Christ in deceit, wild beasts and rabid dogs, which bite in secret.¹⁷ So in his Epistle to the Trallians, he calls those atheists, referring to the Docetae, who say that Christ only suffered in appearance (το δοκεῖν πεπονθέναι), and exhorts his brethren to flee these evil shoots, that bear death-bearing fruit (τας κακας παραφυαδας, τας γεννωσας καρπον θανατηφορον);¹⁸ and again still more pointedly and severely in his Epistle to the Smyrneans, he declares that he who denies that Christ bore flesh (σαρκοφορος) himself bears but his own corpse (νεκροφορος), and in the same connection goes so far even as to say that "the celestial and the glory of angels and those ruling both visible and invisible, if they do not believe in the blood of Christ, even to them there is condemnation."¹⁹ Polycarp *speaks* in the same style, according to Irenaeus,²⁰ calling Marcion "the first born of Satan," and employs the same expression in writing to the Philippians. Justin Martyr also is very careful throughout the whole of his first Apology to keep in distinct view the person of Christ, plainly considering a refusal to acknowledge his divinity a heresy of the most vital consequence (First Apol. c. 6 16, 31, 77, 79, 82, 83, 85, &c., &c.). It is needless to accumulate quotations from writers beyond Justin, upon a point so plain as this. The vast christological struggles of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, all show as clearly as history can show, that the doctrine of Christ's person was the most vital and practical one in the whole range of Christian

¹⁷ εὐθασί γὰρ τινες δόλῳ πονηρῶ το ὄνομα περιφέρειν . . . οὐς δεῖ νμάς ὡς θηρία ἐκκλίνειν, εἰσὶν γὰρ κύνες λυσσῶντες λαθροδῆκται (Epist. ad Ephes. c. vii), "το ὄνομα," as Irenaeus remarks, "is used absolutely for the name of Christ," and in this absolute use of it we can see that it was emphatically *the name*.

¹⁸ Epist. ad Trall. x and xi.

¹⁹ Epist. ad Smyr. v and vi.

²⁰ Irenaeus, after having given an account of Saint John's meeting with Cerinthus writes thus: "et ipse autem Polycarpus Marcioni aliquando occurrenti sibi, et dicenti, Cognosce nos? respondit, Cognosco te primogenitum Satanae," and then adds this remarkable sentence: "Tantum Apostoli et horum discipuli habuerunt timorem, ut neque verbotenus communicarent alicui eorum qui adultaverant veritatem" (Iren. adv. haer. Lib. iii, cap. iii).

Theology. Upon this central point were all the energies of the church exerted. She was assailed, from within and from without; yet she stood firm to the declaration of the Apostle: "Great is the mystery of Godliness—God manifest in the flesh," and finally obtained a triumphant victory.

Irenaeus, whom Tertullian calls "the most diligent searcher of all doctrines," and whom Theodoret calls the "light of the Western Gauls;" Origen; Cyprian; Dionysius Alexander, "doctor of the Catholic Church," according to Athanasius; Gregory the wonder-worker, with his more wonderful Trinitarian Creed, which Gregory Nyssa calls so powerful an antidote for Arian and Semi-Arian heresies;^a were all enlisted in the third century in the struggle, and fought manfully, but only to prepare the way for the more vehement and earnest contest which was to come, and for which the church brought forth a still larger and still nobler band of heroes. It is but extreme ignorance, and merely blind historical skepticism, to set down these life struggles of the early church as mere theoretical speculations, which did but prepare the way for the church's still wider apostacy. Unitarians, and extremely one sided unhistorical Protestants, (to the shame of Protestantism there are many such in her communion), may if they choose entirely disregard the results of these struggles, through fear of *traditionary faith*; and may pour as much contempt as they please upon the barbarous, and as they say meaningless terms, used in defining that which from its nature must ever be mysteriously undefinable; yet they cannot refuse to acknowledge the intense earnestness of the struggles themselves, and that the Church, although according to them the kingdom of Satan, *strangely* felt that her very life was dependent upon the issue. No one can possibly enter into the true spirit of these controversies, without feeling the awful grandeur which surrounds him; whether that grandeur be the wild sport of the prince of darkness, or the awfully mysterious brooding of the Holy Spirit over the struggling and almost prostrate body of the Redeemer.

We come now to inquire what were the peculiar views in regard to the doctrine under examination, to which the Church in her earliest age was so sensitively attached, and for which, as she advanced in years, she so strenuously and successfully contended; and also to inquire what practical bearing they have in reference to a correct idea of the Church and Christianity.

^a See Butler's *Lives of the Saints*.

The point we propose to reach, is, as we have already remarked, this: *The organic union of the distinctly human and divine in the person of Christ as the central point in which Christianity receives its full force and distinctive character, and where the Church therefore must look for its type and contents.*

Let our inquiry commence with the venerable martyr of Antioch.

Saint Ignatius.¹

Nothing is known concerning the parents of Ignatius. Some have supposed that he was the child whom Christ took up in his arms, because he so invariably applied to himself the title Θεοφορος. But his reply to Trajan rather contradicts this supposition, giving to the title its usual signification, God-bearer. Chrysostom distinctly asserts moreover that he never saw Jesus. There have been many different conjectures as to his birth place and country, some supposing him to have been a Syrian rather than a Grecian; others that he was born in Sardinia or Phrygia. It is the tradition that he was the disciple of the Apostle John. Be this as it may, it is clearly evident from his writings and the acts of his martyrdom, that he was a man remarkable for his ardent and devoted piety and his overflowing Christian-love. So highly was he esteemed by his brethren and the Apostles, that he was ordained to the important office of bishop of Anti-

¹ We purposely omit Clement of Rome, as we do not wish at present to examine the objections that have been brought against him upon this point. In our opinion, however, he distinctly asserts the divinity of Christ, and without going through his Epistles in support of this position, we shall transcribe Rev. T. Chevalier's note upon the same point, which is appended to his translation of Clement's first Epistle to the Corinthians. "Thus in c. 2 of this Epistle, we find the words—τοῖς ἐφοδίοις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀρτουμενοὶ, καὶ προσεχούτες τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ ἐπιμελῶς, ἐστερνισμένοι ἢ τοῖς σπλαγχνοῖς καὶ ταῖς παθήματι αὐτοῦ ἢν προ οφθαλμῶν ὡμῶν (Compare Acts xx, 29, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἣν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος). In c. 36, Clement denominates Christ, ἀναγασμα τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ (Θεοῦ). In c. 32, he thus distinguishes the divine nature of Christ from his human nature ἐξ αὐτοῦ (Ἰσραὴλ) ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς. τοῦ κατὰ σὰρκα (compare Romans ix. 5). And in the passage above c. 10, Clement expressly says of Christ, perhaps with an allusion to Phil ii. 5-8, Το σκῆπτρον τῆς μεγαλωσύνης τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, οὐκ ἦλθεν ἐν κομπῇ ἀλαζονείας, οὐδὲ ὑπερηφανίας, καὶ περ δυνάμενος. ἀλλὰ ταπεινοφρονῶν." See Bishop Bull, Defensio Fid. Nicaen. sec. ii. c. 3. His second Epistle is much more distinct than the one just noticed, and will be sufficiently conclusive to any one that will read it. Its introduction is, Ἀδελφοί, οὕτως δεῖ ὑμᾶς φρονεῖν περὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς περὶ Θεοῦ, ὡς περὶ κριτοῦ ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν.

och, the central city of Syria. Some following the Apostolic Constitutions say, that he was ordained by Saint Paul in connection with Evodius who was ordained by Saint Peter: others say that he was ordained by John the evangelist. Eusebius states that he succeeded Evodius, and Theodoret, that he immediately succeeded Saint Peter. It is most probable however that he became bishop of Antioch on the death of Evodius, being ordained by one of the Apostles then living. His zeal and fidelity were remarkable, gaining him the reputation of being a "man in all things like the Apostles." In his Christian watchfulness over his flock, he is represented as one "who, like a good pilot by the helm of prayer and fasting, and by the constancy of teaching, and by spiritual earnestness (τῷ τῶν τῶ πνευματικῶ), held out against the storms that beat against him, lest he should lose any of those who were of little courage and simple,"* and in the same connection, in the acts of his martyrdom, the power of his instruction is thus highly extolled: "Wherefore remaining for a few years longer in the Church, and as a *divine lamp* illuminating (λυχνίου διχην θειχου φωτιζων) the understanding of each one through his exegesis of the Scriptures, he obtained the end of his prayer, (referring to his martyrdom, which he very much desired and even prayed for, that thus he might be brought into closer and more intimate union with the Lord). His eminent Christian zeal and fidelity, in the age of persecution, marked him out as one that must seal the truth of his doctrines and faith with his own blood, and in the ninth year of the reign of Trajan, who, elated with his recent Scythian and Dacian conquests, commenced a bitter persecution against the Christians, he was thrown to the wild beasts in the Ampitheatre at Rome. Many instead of placing the time of his martyrdom in the year 107, the ninth year of Trajan's reign, have given it a somewhat later date, 115 and 116. The latter is probably the most correct. His journey from Antioch to Rome, the scene of his greatest sufferings and triumph, tedious and degrading as it was, was converted by the power of his faith into a triumphal entrance into that kingdom where martyrdom was the *crown*, and chains and bonds the jewels. His progress is very fully described in the acts of his martyrdom. First from Antioch to Seleucia, thence with a very troublesome voyage to Smyrna, where with unspeakable joy he met his fellow disciple Saint Polycarp, bishop of the Church at this place, and also the bishops, presby-

* Martyrium S. Igna. c. 1.

ters and deacons, of the other Asiatic Churches, who had come to visit him in his bonds. He desired not to stay with them however, but earnestly entreated the holy Polycarp to pray that "quickly disappearing from earth by wild beasts, he might appear before the face of Christ." While at Smyrna, he sent letters to the churches, through the officers they had sent to visit him, "distilling spiritual grace with prayer and exhortation," and also one to the Romans, to prepare the way for his death, which from the beginning to the end is filled with true Ignatian fire and spirit. From Smyrna he set sail and came to Troas; where he wrote to the churches of Smyrna and Philadelphia, and also to Polycarp. From Troas he went to Neapolis; thence over the Adriatic into the Tyrrhene sea; and finally entered the Roman port, rejoicing in the very jaws of death, that he was thought worthy to die for Christ. He was immediately thrown to the wild beasts, and devoured. But so sacred was he in the esteem of the church, "that the more solid parts of his body which remained were carried to Antioch, and put down in lime, as an inestimable treasure, left to the holy church by the grace which was in the Martyr."³ The same burning devotion, and the same Christian meekness, which were manifest in his acts, also predominantly display themselves in all his writings. Especially noticeable is his abounding love, and his exalted view of the supernatural *significancy* of the *Christian ministry* and the *Christian church*. This latter comes out with *remarkable prominence* in every Epistle, and indeed in almost every paragraph. Love and respect your Bishop as Christ, is ever upon his tongue, and, Be ye united as one single body under one single visible head, seems to be the strong under current in all his writings.⁴ But we have digressed already too long, and must

³ Μόνα γὰρ τὰ τραχύτερα τῶν ἀγίων αὐτοῦ λειψάνων περιλειφθῆ, αὐτὰ εἰς τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν ἀπεκομισθῆ, καὶ ἐν λίμνῃ κατετεθῆ, θησαυρὸς ἀτιμητὸς ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν τῷ μαρτυρίῳ χάριτος τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ καταλειφθέντα (Martyr. S. Igna. c. vi). This is spoken of also by Chrysostom.

⁴ Any one that will take the pains to read any of the Epistles of Ignatius, cannot fail to be struck with the *peculiar force* of his exalted views of the ministry, and indeed of every thing connected with the church; and at the same time also with his entire absence and negation of that spirit of independency, and private creed-making, which is now so lamentably prevalent. His *abhorrence* of any thing like division and schism is *instinctive*. This naturally grows out of his conception of Church Catholicity. With him, the church is not one in the way of sympathy, but in the way of a *living and visible organism*. Every *form* of her existence must be the full reflex of the supernatural power and the living unity of her inward constitution; and the authority she possesses as the objective bearer of the life of Christ,

turn to his Epistles and examine the weight of his testimony upon the doctrine of Christ's person, this being the point which we have more directly in view.

We do not expect of course to find in his epistles any logical or scientific presentation of the doctrine in question ; for these early fathers, as Saint Cyprian has well remarked, "knew better how to die than to dispute." The period in which they lived was not one of doctrinal precision and scientific definiteness, but of persecutions and trials, of internal strugglings and new unfolding life ; and even the outward circumstances under which Ignatius wrote, if there were nothing else, rendered it almost impossible that this should be the case. His own church, very near to his heart, was without a bishop, (a matter of *peculiar* concern to Ignatius,) and persecutions were springing up on every side ; and his mind was also continually absorbed in the approaching glories of his martyrdom. Notwithstanding all these conflicting circumstances, so important was the Redeemer to his faith, that every thing is made to centre around his person. In the very presence of the emperor himself, he rejoices to confess one God and one Christ, and in every single epistle we have a full recognition of the divine and human nature of Christ, although most frequently in a general way. Also that same *instinctive* severity against every heresy that touches in the least the mystery of the incarnation, which, as we have before said, was the peculiar characteristic of that period, ever manifests itself ; and the unity and authority of the church is ever enforced and illustrated by a reference to the Trinity, as being involved however in a single visible representation, in the bishop, presbyters and deacons. "Without these there is no church." As we have already said, Ignatius speaks in a general way in reference to the constitution of Christ's person, yet this very fact itself, and the perfect consciousness which he seems to have that he is broaching no new doctrine, which can meet with the least objection on the part of any of the churches to which he was writing, together with the bitter reproach which

must with him exist in some single functionary representative (or representatives). This is at least the tendency of his whole tone of thought. It is no more than just in this connection to say, that he is in most respects *heterodox*, if judged from a Puritan stand-point, and also that there is in fact scarcely a face in the polyhedral mirror of Protestantism, from which the image of this worthy disciple of the beloved John can be reflected, without woful distortions. To him emphatically the sect system would be the abomination of abominations.

he ever casts upon those that hold different opinions, all instead of arguing against the position which we have laid down, (viz., that Ignatius distinctly asserts the humanity and divinity of Christ,) are strongly in its favor; showing at least, that it was the faith which the church lived, if not that which it logically defined.

In his Epistle to the Ephesians this position can be recognized from the very beginning to the end. His introduction is to the church at Ephesus, united through the will of the Father and Jesus Christ, our God (του Θεου ημων), wishing it much happiness in Jesus Christ and his spotless grace." The connection between the Father and Jesus Christ, made still more binding by the explanative clause "του Θεου ημων," which refers with equal force to both, evidently grows out of the consciousness of their equality and co-operation. In c. 1, he speaks of their having been "rekindled into life by the blood of God" (αναζωοπυρησantes εν αιματι Θεου). In c. 2, he tells them that they should "glorify Christ who has glorified them;" (the worship of Christ and the view of the sacraments are perhaps the strongest and most satisfactory evidence, that this early period of the church affords, of the divinity and humanity of Christ). In c. 3, he calls Christ "our inseparable life" (το αδιακριτον ημων ζην). There cannot well be in any language a more forcible expression than this, to denote our union with Christ and its vivific force. The very position and nature of the words denote it—"αδιακριτον ημων" coming between the article το and ζην makes it of necessity a qualification of the latter, and ζην connected with the article becomes a verbal noun, signifying the moving principle of life, the "the to live" of the Christian. In c. 4, (the passage is so beautiful, and withal such a powerful comment upon modern independency and sectarianism, as to warrant us in quoting it entire) he writes: "It is becoming you to turn in with the opinion of your bishop, which also ye do. For your renowned presbytery, worthy of God, has been so fitted to the bishop as chords to a harp. Wherefore in your unanimity and harmonious love *Jesus Christ* is sung; and man to man ye make up the chorus, that, being harmonious in concord and having taken up the melody of God, in oneness ye may sing in one voice, through Jesus Christ, to the Father; that he may hear you, at the same time also recognizing by your well-doing that ye are *members of his Son*. It is useful that ye should be in unblameable unity, that ye may also participate of God." In c. 5, he speaks of the Ephesians being "joined to their bishop as the church to Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ to the Father, that

all may be harmonious in *unity* ;” and thus exhorts them saying ; “ Let no one be deceived. If any one be not within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God.” This seems to be as it were a satire upon the modern church skepticism and mode of thought, which recognizes no living and visible unity in the church, and no direct communication of her supernatural life to her members. In c. 6, he says, fearing the baneful influence of those heresies which were already springing up, outside and inside the church, “ Hear ye nothing farther than Jesus Christ, who speaks in truth ;” and then continues in c. 7, evidently presenting the true doctrine which these heresies denied : “ One physician there is, carnal and spiritual, born and unborn, God existing in the flesh, both from Mary and from God, first passible and then impassible.”⁶ In c. 9, he calls his brethren “ stones of the temple of the Father prepared for the building of God the Father, raised on high by the machine of Jesus Christ which is the cross, using for a cord the Holy Spirit, their faith being their leader, and love the road leading Godward ;” and in the same connection thus exhorts them : “ Εστε οὖν καὶ συνοδοὶ

⁶ Εἰς ἰατρός ἐστιν, σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός γενήτος καὶ ἀγενήτος (a) ἐν σαρκὶ γενομένος Θεός, ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινὴ (b) καὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ πρῶτον παθὴτος καὶ τότε ἀπαθῆς (Ἰησοῦς Χριστός Ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν (c)).—(a) Many read in place of “ γενήτος καὶ ἀγενήτος ” “ γεννήτος καὶ ἀγεννήτος,” yet after all in the general use of these words there is no difference in their meaning. They evidently spring from the same root and can have the same general signification, although after the Council of Nice an important distinction was made between them, which was scrupulously observed. Bishop Bull (*Defensio Fid. Nic. cap. 2, 5, 6,*) translates the words “ create and uncreate,” although he reads *γεννήτος καὶ ἀγεννήτος* ; and Athanasius evidently understood Ignatius to hold in these words that Christ was man and God, for he quotes thence for this very purpose : “ πεπεισμεθα ὅτι καὶ ὁ μακάριος Ἰγνατίος ὀρθῶς ἐγράψε, γενήπον αὐτὸν λέγων διὰ τὴν σάρκα· ὁ γὰρ Χριστὸς σὰρξ ἐγένετο· ἀγενήτον δὲ, ὅτι μὴ τῶν ποιημάτων καὶ γενήτων ἐστίν, ἀλλ υἱὸς ἐκ πατρὸς (Athan. *de synodis*, as quoted by Rev. Chevalier). Theodoret reads *γεννήτος ἐξ ἀγεννήτου*. Tertullian from the similarity of thought and language evidently refers to this passage when he writes (*de Carne Christi, cap. 5*): “ Ita utriusque substantiae census hominem et Deum exhibuit: hinc natum, inde non natum; hinc carneum, inde spiritalem; hinc infirmum, inde praeferentem; hinc morientem, inde viventem. Quae proprietates conditionum, divinae et humanae, aequa utique naturae utriusque veritate dispuncta est, eadem fide et spiritus et carnis.—(b) “ In death true life.” The great probability is that *θανάτῳ* is correct and *ἀθανάτῳ* incorrect ; for it would be difficult if not impossible to give any meaning to the passage whatever, by retaining *ἀθανάτῳ*, while by substituting *θανάτῳ* it would be very forcible and consistent.—(c) These words are in the passage as quoted by Theodoret in the fifth century, and also in the old Latin version (See Rev. T. Chevalier’s note upon this passage, in his translation of this Epistle).

παντες θεοφοροι και ναοφοροι, χριστοφοροι, αγιοφοροι, κατα παντα κηκοσμημενοι εντολαις Ιησου Χριστου.” In c. 17, he writes: “For this cause did the Lord receive ointment upon his head, that he might breathe into the church incorruptibility.” In c. 18, thus: “For our God Jesus Christ was born in the womb of Mary, according to the economy of God, from the seed of David, but of the Holy Ghost.* Who was born and baptized, that by suffering he might purify water.” In c. 20, he speaks of an economy “εις τον καινον ανθρωπον Ιησουν Χριστον,” and concludes by gathering all the redemptive force of the incarnation into the Lord’s Supper, as the central source of life and ground of unity: “Since ye all individually come together through grace in one faith and one Jesus Christ, who was from the race of David according to the flesh, the Son of man and the Son of God . . . breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote that we shall not die but live in Christ forever.” In c. 21, he concludes his Epistle, as he commenced, in God the Father and the Son, saying: “Farewell (ερρωσθε, more properly perhaps *be ye strong* from ρωννυμι) in God the Father and in Jesus Christ our common hope” (τη κοινη ελπιδι ημων).

We have thus given somewhat minutely the language of Saint Ignatius in reference to the person of Christ, as found in his Epistle to the Ephesians. It is evident from the quotations which we have made that Ignatius, whatever may be his meaning, truly represents the faith of the church at that time. The whole style of his writing flows from a consciousness, that he is the true exponent of her life, and sometimes he even places himself in the position of her spiritual teacher. It is absolutely absurd to imagine that he was a heretic in her bosom, or that as “Shepherd of Syria” he misrepresented her doctrines. With the same propriety, and with as much truth, might one term Washington a Tory. It might be well to examine here, more closely than we have, his view of the church in connection with the doctrine in hand, being so intimately connected as they are; but this will come in more properly hereafter, where we make an application in this way of the doctrine, as more clearly and fully brought to view by subsequent writers.

It must not be supposed, that this single Epistle is the only

* εκ σπερματος μεν Δαβιδ, πνευματος δε αγιου. In this sentence the particle μεν anticipates a possible wrong construction, the possibility of which is removed by the answering particle δε. The first assertion would be incomplete without the second, and hence the passage in its grammatical structure is a strong evidence in our favor.

source from which we can determine what position Ignatius held; for it is perhaps less explicit than any of his other Epistles. In his short Epistle to the Magnesians, there is the same full and even fuller flow of testimony, the same absolute horror of any thing like division, and the same peculiar view of church authority and *representative* unity. The church must be *solidly one*. He addresses the letter to the Magnesians, more immediately for the purpose of recommending to them unity among themselves, and subjection to their bishop, who as it appears was quite young, (this forms the substance of the letter); yet he continually refers to the person of Christ as the ground of this unity and obedience, for as he says, "the unity in them is both of the *body* and *spirit* of *Jesus Christ*, our eternal life (*εν αις ενωσιν ενχομαι σαρκος και πνευματος Ιησου Χριστου, του διαπαντος ημων ζην*). A few extracts from this Epistle must suffice. In c. 7, after earnestly exhorting them "to come together in one place and to have one prayer, one supplication, one mind, and one hope," he says: "There is one Jesus Christ, than whom there is nothing better. Come together therefore all of you as to one temple of God, as to one altar, as to one Jesus Christ, who came forth from one father, being and abiding in one (*και εις ενα οντα και χωρησαντα*). It is plain to be seen, that this passage grew out of the previous exhortation in the same paragraph, which in its tone of thought is peculiarly Ignatian, and at the same time peculiarly unpuritanical, viz, "*Μηδε πειρασητε ενλογον τι φαινεσθαι ιδια υμων*." In c. 8, after guarding them against strange doctrines, and mentioning that the Holy Prophets lived according to Christ, he calls Him "the eternal Word of God, not proceeding from silence (*λογος αιδιος ουκ απο σιγης*);" and near the conclusion of the letter he recommends them "to advance to a full knowledge (*πεπληροφορησθαι*) in the birth, suffering, and resurrection, which happened in the time of the government of Pontius Pilate."

In all the other Epistles of Ignatius, the same view of Christ's person is sustained. In his Epistle to the Trallians, he very distinctly and emphatically asserts the humanity of Christ in these words: "Stop your ears therefore when any one speaks to you separate from Christ, who was of the race of David, of the Virgin Mary, who was truly born, and both ate and drank, and was truly crucified and died, those in heaven and upon earth and under the earth witnessing it, and who truly rose from the

* Whatever reference may be given to "*απο σιγης*" the clause clearly recognizes the absolute eternity of Christ as the Son of God.

dead.”* So also in c. 11 of the same Epistle, he is equally plain in reference to his divinity, saying that “God has promised a union which is himself (οὐ δύναται οὐν κεφαλὴ χωρὶς γεννηθῆναι ἀνεν μελῶν, τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐνωσιν ἐπαγγελλομένου, ὅς ἐστιν αὐτός).”

The same is the case with his Epistle to the Romans, in which the whole ardor and devotion of his soul, and the glorious triumph of his faith over the gloomy prospect of an excruciating death, beautifully and glowingly portray themselves. This letter, as we have already remarked, was written at Smyrna to the church at Rome, to prepare the way for his martyrdom; for he seems to have had some fears, that through their intercession he might lose the privilege of sealing his confession of Christ with his own blood. It *may be* from this fact that he commences it as he does; or it may be perhaps from the central position that Rome then held in the political world; yet what ever may have been the cause, he warmly rejoices in her *pre-eminent* worth, and adorns her in the language of his introduction with a complete wreath of emphatic adjectives, (ἀξιοθεός, αξιοπρεπής, αξιομαρτίστος, ἀξιεπαίνας, ἀξιεπιτευχτός, ἀξιαγνός καὶ προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης, ἀριστωνυμός, πατρωνυμός). Throughout the whole of this letter, his mind is completely absorbed, and raised above earth and suffering, with the prospect of meeting with Christ through his own martyrdom. “Permit me,” he writes in c. 4 with intense earnestness, “to be the food of wild beasts, through whom I can meet with God. I am the wheat of God, and by the teeth of wild beasts I shall be ground, so that I shall be found the pure bread of Christ;” and in the same connection a little farther on: “If I shall suffer, I shall be the freedman of Christ, and shall rise again free in him;” and again in c. 5, (it is impossible

* Κωφώθητε οὐκ, όταν ὑμῖν χωρὶς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ λαλή τις, τοῦ ἐκ γενούς Δαβὶδ, τοῦ ἐκ Μαρίας, ὃς ἀληθῶς ἐγεννηθῆ, ἐφαγεν τε καὶ ἐπλεν, ἀληθῶς ἐδωχθῆ ἐπὶ Ἡοντίου Πιλάτου, ἀληθῶς ἐσταυρώθῆ καὶ ἀπέθανεν . . . οὐ χωρὶς τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ ζῆν οὐκ ἐχομεν (Ep. ad Trall. c. IX). This is evidently written to oppose those who denied the real humanity of Christ, as may be seen from what follows it, in the next paragraph; where he gives the title of atheists to those, who believe that Christ was only man in appearance. The same argument is used by Tertullian, in support of the same position. “Natus est Dei Filius: non pudet, quia pudendum est; et mortuus est Dei Filius: prorsus credibile est, quia ineptum est; et sepultus resurrexit: certum est, quia impossibile est. Sed haec quomodo in illo vera erunt, si ipse non fuit verus, si non vere haberit in se quod figeretur, quod moreretur, quod sepeliretur et resuscitaretur: carnem scilicet hanc, sanguine suffusam, ossibus substractam, nervis intextam, venis implexam” (Tertull. de Carn. Christi. c. 5, as quoted by Hooker).

to imagine a more sublime picture of Christian heroism): "Let nothing visible or invisible envy me, that I attain unto Christ. Let fire and the cross, herds of wild beasts, lacerations, rendings, scatterings of bones, tearing off of limbs, manglings of the whole body and the evil torments of the devil come upon me, only that I may meet with Jesus Christ." In c. 7 also, the whole ardor and heavenly fire of his soul bursts forth in burning, winged words: "My love is crucified, and there is in me no matter-loving fire, but water living and speaking in me, saying from within, Hither to the Father. I delight not in the nourishment of corruption nor in the pleasures of this life. The bread of God I wish, that heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was born in this last time of the seed of David and Abraham: and the drink of God I wish, his blood, which is incorruptible love and yearless life."

The same entire consecration to Christ manifests itself in his Epistle to the Philadelphians and to Polycarp. Christ ever appears as the sum and substance of his faith; not as divine only, and operating by mere spiritual influence, but as human; thus making it possible for him to be inserted into his body and flesh. This especially presents itself in his Epistle to the Smyrneans, a single passage of which only we shall quote. C. 1: "I glorify Jesus Christ, who is God, who thus has made you wise. For I have perceived that you are cemented in immovable faith, being nailed as it were to the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ, both in body and spirit, and being grounded in love in the blood of Christ; being fully instructed in our Lord, as to his being truly from the seed of David according to the flesh, and the Son of God according to the will and power of God; as to his being truly born from the Virgin and baptized by John, in order that he might fulfil all righteousness: as to his being truly nailed for us, under Pontius Pilate and Herod the tetrarch, in the flesh. By which fruit we are by His most blessed suffering that we may set up with him a token for all ages, through the resurrection, for the holy and faithful followers of him, whether among the Jews or Gentiles, in one body of his church." These quotations must suffice to show the spirit and doctrine of this noble martyr.

It has not been our design to enter into a critical examination of the terms employed by Ignatius in reference to the person of Christ, but only to show that there is no necessary contradiction between his own position and that of the church as more positively defined afterwards; and by the way it is entirely wrong, to isolate his position from that of the church afterward, for eve-

ry grade of development more clearly defines that which precedes it and upon which it is based. We have admitted already that his language lacks that doctrinal precision which was afterwards employed, but this does not prove by any means that his *faith* lacked contents; for how could it have been otherwise? Christianity in its scientific aspect is not a merely dead system of doctrines and formulas, the same yesterday to-day and forever in its form and apprehension, but is in its very nature historical. In its own progress do its contents, on the part of the church, become more clearly apprehended by the understanding, and thus become capable of being more clearly defined in the way of doctrine. The leaf of the plant, for example, is at first scarcely *characterized* to the general observation, and it is only in its full development that all of its parts are fully understood in their mutual relations, for then only can the whole process of its growth be placed before the mind. So in the church. The normative ground of all doctrine lies in the written word; but not yet has the church fully developed its own doctrinal life; for from the nature of the case, this can only go along with her *universal* development. Creeds are not the product of superstition, nor mechanical guides to direct the ignorant, but are the full living presentation of the objective realities of faith. They guide, yet freely, for we can only be led by them as we enter into their inner sanctuary of meaning, and then we do not follow them, but lay hold of them, and live in them; and find, although they stand immoveably fixed, that they have a wondrous history, and a mysterious power. Our point then has been to show by quotations, that the divinity and humanity of Christ was an essential *article of the faith* of Ignatius, and that it was the necessary *pre-position* in all that he has written. There is not a single quotation which we have made, that would not be almost entirely unintelligible from a Docetic or Ebionitic standpoint. Thus much in reference to the christology of Ignatius. In another place we shall examine its bearing upon the church. In conclusion we would say, that the mysterious force and depth of Ignatius' faith in the supernatural character and power of the church and all its offices, deriving them directly from the person of Christ, out of whose permanent presence they are made to flow, (οπου αν φανη ο επισκοπος, εκει το πληθος εστω' ωσπερ οπου αν η Χριστος Ιησους, εκει η καθολικη εκκλησια; Ep. ad Smyrn. c. viii,) has been so novel and strange to our Protestant-trained tone of thought, that we have lingered with him, forgetting for the time entirely the venerable Polycarp, to whom in our next, together with Justin Martyr, we shall turn our attention.

EVANGELICAL RADICALISM.

THE CHURCH MEMBER'S MANUAL OF ECCLESIASTICAL PRINCIPLES, DOCTRINE AND DISCIPLINE: *Presenting a systematic view of the structure, polity, doctrines, and practices of Christian Churches, as taught in the Scriptures.* By WILLIAM CROWELL, &c. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1852.

A truly interesting and suggestive book—though not exactly in the way of its own intention. The author is a Baptist, who proposes to set forth a scheme of the Church to suit the rationalistic standpoint of his own sect; “his only desire being to follow truth, wherever it may lead.” To answer the question, “What and where is the church?” he scorns the thought of taking counsel of the Church itself. “I might as well go to Delphi or Dodona,” he tells us, “or the shrine of Jupiter Ammon, to inquire who is the god, and where is his temple.” Pagan and Christian theocracies, it seems, are alike without truth and entitled to no trust. The whole appeal must be “*to the Bible*,” which means, of course, to the Bible as read by William Crowell and his Baptist brethren, in distinction from the reading of Presbyterians, Lutherans, &c., &c., as well as from the sense attached to it by the ancient Fathers and the Catholic Church of all past ages. “Hitherto Baptists have paid but little attention to the subject of church polity;” too busy with the interests of “*spiritual Christianity in its primitive form*,” to give much attention to any such outward concern. We will not pretend here to go minutely into the theory now concocted out of the Bible, for their special accommodation and use, by this *Church Member's Manual*. Suffice it to say, that it is pre-eminently rationalistic. The idea of a general church, save in the sense of a mere abstraction, is discarded; the only true order in the case, is that of *many distinct churches*, each perfectly original and independent in its own sphere. A church thus is simply an association of believers, who join together in this way for their common advantage in the Christian life, under the pledge of baptism. “Men have a natural right to associate by mutual agreement for the accomplishment of any innocent or useful purpose. In this way civil government was first formed, and God owned the institution as one of his own appointment. The disciples of Christ have the right to unite themselves together in churches, for the promotion of their piety and the spread of the Gospel, unless he has forbidden them in his revealed word. This he has not done. It is, therefore

from the nature of the case, proper that men should unite in a mutual, voluntary covenant for religious purposes. The objects in view are more important than those attained in the civil compact, in which men unite in a mutual covenant for a common benefit; and the act is as reasonable and as necessary in itself."—P. 55, 56. Every particular church, so formed by *social contract*, holds its powers directly and exclusively from Christ, who alone is head over all things to the *churches*, without the intervention of Pope, Bishop, or General Assembly. "Each one," as the celebrated Dr. Wayland dogmatizes the matter, "is a perfect and complete system. The decisions of one are not binding on another. Each one is at liberty to interpret the laws of Christ for itself, and to govern itself according to that interpretation. Each church is therefore as essentially independent of every other, as though each one were the only church in Christendom."—P. 80. So runs this *Bible* scheme of the Baptists. We have no room here to go into any close consideration of its merits. But it speaks for itself. Only think of Rousseau's theory of *social contract*, deliberately applied to the grand and glorious mystery of the HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH.

The scheme is completely at war, it will be readily seen, with what was held to be Christianity in the first ages. Of this its patrons may not feel it necessary to make any account. Enough that they can pretend to have the Bible at all events on their side. Weighed against such authority, of what worth or force is Christian antiquity—even though it *should* reach back to the very age next following that of the Apostles? Still however the fact is one, which ought to be distinctly seen and acknowledged. Let it pass for what it may, it deserves to be fully understood and held up to view. This Baptist theory of Christianity is not what was held to be the "mystery of godliness," in the early church. Neither is the difference circumstantial only and accidental. It goes to the heart of religion. It has to do with its universal system. We have in the two cases actually two gospels, two altogether different versions of the Christian salvation. In one case, all rests on the Creed; in the other this fundamental symbol is charged with heresy and falsehood. In one case, the church is made to be supernatural, and is honored as the real medium of salvation to her children; in the other she is treated as a "figment" in every such view, and falls into the conception of a social contract. The ministry in one case holds its commission and its powers from God; in the other case it is the creature of man. In the one case, the sacraments are ~~seals~~ and bearers of heavenly grace; in the other, they possess

no such mystic force whatever. The creed of the ancient church, this modern system openly turns into a lie. What all antiquity believed, it takes a pride in refusing to believe; and affects to be *spiritual*, by treating with contempt the real mystery of the Spirit's presence, in the only form in which it was to all Christian antiquity 'an object of faith. How can too such contrary systems be considered for one moment the same? They exclude each other. If one is to stand, the other must fall. Brought before the tribunal of this modern system, the ancient Christianity is found to be altogether wrong and false. We have only however to reverse the procedure, by bringing the modern system to the bar of the ancient, and at once the falsehood and wrong fall just as conclusively over to the other side. The two schemes are completely at issue. The contest between them is one of life and death. When the modern system challenges our faith, it asks us in fact to renounce all connection with the faith and religious life of the Church of the first ages. And so on the other hand if we feel it necessary to hold fast to the communion of this primitive piety—if we cannot bear the thought of giving up all spiritual fellowship with the martyrs, confessors, fathers and saints, of the early ages, and are not willing to set them all down for fanatics and fools—if we tremble to stigmatize the Christianity that conquered the Roman world as the invention of Satan, root and branch—we must not, and dare not, shrink from the responsibility of declaring the rationalistic unsacramental system now before us a dangerous delusion, which all who value the salvation of their souls are bound religiously to avoid. It would have been so regarded, beyond all controversy, by the universal church in the beginning. There would have been as little patience with it precisely, as there was with Gnosticism. It would have been branded openly as a virtual denial of the entire mystery of the Gospel. Of this, we say, there can be no doubt, and in regard to it there should be no equivocation or disguise.

Shall we be told then, that it is harsh to think and speak as we do of the religious system now under consideration, because it embraces a large amount of respectable Christian profession at the present time, and is nothing more in fact than the last phase of what is called orthodox Puritanism, which many hold to be the very perfection and *ne plus ultra* of evangelical religion? We reply by asking, How is it to be helped? We are shut up to a sore dilemma here, from which there is no possible escape. We must break with this modern Puritanic system, or else break with the whole Christianity of the first ages. No sophistry can

cause them to appear the same. The Creed of the one, is the Lie of the other. What was the mystery of godliness in the old church, this new faith unblushingly declares to be the mystery of iniquity. In such circumstances we have no choice, except to say with which of the two interests we hold it best to make common cause. To justify the one, is necessarily to condemn the other. To show respect towards this new faith, because it is outwardly respectable, must we cover with reproach and disgrace the old faith from the days of Polycarp and Ignatius to those of Ambrose and Augustine? Do we owe no respect also, and no charity, to the first Christian ages? What right indeed can those have to demand our tenderness and forbearance, in so grave a case, who make no account whatever of the reputation or credit of whole centuries of past Christian history, but modestly require us to set them all down as heretical and false over against themselves? What is the peculiar merit of this Baptist Puritanism, a thing comparatively of yesterday, that it should be allowed thus to insult all Christian antiquity, and have full exemption at the same time from every unfavorable judgment upon its own pretensions and claims? "What!" we may well say to it in the language of St. Paul, "Came the word of God out from you; or came it unto you only?" Who art thou, upstart system! that thou shouldst set thyself in such proud style above the universal church of antiquity—the immediate successors of the Apostles, the noble army of martyrs, the goodly fellowship of the fathers, the vast cloud of witnesses that look down upon us from these ages of faith—charging it with wholesale superstition and folly, and requiring us to renounce its creed, the whole scheme and habit of its religious life, and to accept from *thy* hands, in place of it, another form of belief, another scheme of doctrine altogether, as infallibly true and right? Who gave thee this authority? Whence came such infallibility?

With immense self-complacency, the system lays its hand on the Bible, and says: This is my warrant. Aye, but who is to interpret this written revelation? *Reason*, replies the system. "The Bible is the church's supreme law, reason is her court. The Bible is the compass; reason, lighted by the Spirit of God, is the binnacle lamp." There we have it. Reason, every man's reason for himself, the world's private judgment and common sense with such religious illumination as it may come to in its own sphere, is the court, the tribunal, by which the law in this case is to take the form of truth and life. Is that not rationalism almost without disguise? What more could the worst radi-

calism ask or want? But for the present, let that pass. Baptist Puritanism appeals to the Bible. We now boldly deny, that it has the Bible on its side. This goes on the contrary full as much against its claims and pretensions throughout, as Christian antiquity itself. When it seems to have any part of the Bible in its favor, it is only by reading into it in the first place its own sense, by begging before hand the whole question in debate, by taking for granted what is to be proved, and by making its own rationalistic hypothesis in this way the standpoint from which is taken afterwards every observation of the Divine text. Even then the result is at best but a lame and forced construction. The New Testament is as far removed, as it well can be, from the Baptist and Independent habit of mind. It proceeds throughout on the assumption, that Christianity is a mystery, a constitution above nature, objectively at hand under a real historical form in the world, to which men must submit by faith in such view in order to be saved. This of itself involves the whole doctrine of the Church, with its Divine jurisdiction and heavenly powers, its ministry starting from Christ, its grace bearing sacraments, its unity and catholicity, the universal course of the new creation, we may say, as it is made to pass before us in the Creed. Only let the standpoint of this old faith be taken, in reading the Scriptures, the same that was occupied by the church in the beginning, and it will soon be found all that is needed, to expose the huge illusions of the Baptist exegesis, and to set the Bible before us in a wholly different light and sense.

And why should *not* this old standpoint be taken, when we thus approach the Bible? Why should we renounce the posture of faith in which the ancient church stood, and take, at the bidding of Puritanism, what must be considered as compared with it a posture of infidelity or no-faith, that we may be supposed to study God's word to purpose and effect? The absurdity of such a requirement is greater than can be easily expressed. Its most enormous presumption may well fill us with wonder and surprise.

J. W. N

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

NOVEMBER, 1852.

VOL. IV.---NO. VI.

CYPRIAN.

Fourth and Last Article.

THE year 252 brought with it new trials for the Christian Church. There would seem to be a mysterious sympathy between the moral and physical worlds, by which every great catastrophe or crisis in the first is found to be marked more or less distinctly by corresponding tokens and signs in the second. When the foundations of society are about to give way, men's hearts are made often to faint and fear by strange signs of wrath in the course of nature. So it was before the destruction of Jerusalem; and something of the same sort we meet with in the last period of the old Pagan empire of Rome. The decline of the state, the breaking up of the ancient order of life, seemed to draw along with it calamity and disaster in all conceivable forms. The universal course of the world was so ordered, as to proclaim continually its own vanity and misery. On this subject we may learn much from Augustine. Long before his time however, these signs of wrath had begun to show themselves in the economy of God's providence, filling whole lands with ap-

prehension and fear. Wars, rumors of wars, famine, pestilence, and flood, united with the sense of perpetual political insecurity, to make men weary of the present, and to beget within them a feeling of desperation at the same time with regard to the future. At the time of which we now speak, under the reign of Callus and Volusianus, a most fearful plague was moving, like a Divine curse, over the length and breadth of the civilized world. With this were joined in some parts of the empire other public calamities, such as drought and famine. As usual, these visitations served to inflame the popular heathen mind against the followers of Christ. They were regarded always as the enemies of the reigning order of things; they refused to take part in the religious sacrifices that were ordered to propitiate the gods; and it became a merit accordingly, in the eyes of fanaticism, to stir up the magistrates against them as a class of persons who had no right to live. The way was opened thus for a new persecution.

It was in reference to this, that the term of penitential discipline was cut short, as already remarked, in the case of those who had before fallen and were now seeking to be restored again to the peace of the church. "Inasmuch as we see," Cyprian writes to Cornelius of Rome in the name of a whole African council (Ep. 57), "that the day of another persecution is close at hand, and are admonished by many urgent signs to arm and prepare ourselves for the conflict set before us by the enemy, as also by our exhortations to get in readiness the people whom God has deigned to commit to our charge, and to gather within the Lord's camp all his soldiers who call for arms and ask to be led to battle—we have judged, in obedience to necessity, that reconciliation should be given to such as have not forsaken the church, but have persevered since the first day of their fall in doing penance, bewailing their sin and imploring mercy of the Lord, and that they ought to be equipped and furnished for the struggle which is drawing near. For heed must be given to the fair signs and warnings of the time, that the sheep may not be left exposed by the shepherds, but the whole flock be collected together, and the Lord's army made ready for the contest of the heavenly war." In such circumstances it might be trusted, that no improper advantage would be taken of this indulgence. It was to be hoped that penitents thus restored would be found ready now, with others, to die for their faith; in which case the reconciliation would turn out to have been on the part of the bishops, "whose office it was as priests to celebrate daily sacrifices to God," a true priestly function preparing victims for the

glorious altar of martyrdom. If however any should seek restoration without this mind, they must be left to the judgment of the Lord. It was not meet that their fault should stand in the way of so great a benefit, in favor of others who might be ready in truth to embrace the martyr's crown. "Nor let any one object," the epistle goes on to say, "that he who receives martyrdom is baptized in his own blood, and needs no peace from the bishop, having in prospect the crown of a higher acceptance and more glorious reward from the Lord. For in the first place, no one can be equal to martyrdom, who is not armed for battle by the church, and the mind must fail which is not raised and inflamed by the participation of the eucharist. Our Lord says in his Gospel : ' When they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak ; for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak ; for it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you ' (Math. x : 19, 20). But when it is said that the Spirit of the Father speaks in those who are delivered up and called to confess the Saviour's name, how can any one be found ready and prepared for such confession, who shall not first have received by the peace of the church the Spirit of the Father, who himself speaks and confesses in us by the strength he imparts to his servants ?" Then in the second place, if flight were chosen instead of the martyr's crown, and the penitent should be cut off by untimely death in the period of his exile, " must it not be laid to our account that so good a soldier, who gave up all and forsook house and parents and children to follow his Lord, has departed this life without peace and communion ?" May not the shepherds be charged in the day of judgment with unfaithfulness to their trust, who thus neglect the sheep so solemnly committed to their hands ?

No military chief, on the eve of battle, could be more solicitous for the good conduct of his soldiers, than Cyprian was that the professed servants of Christ should quit themselves valiantly for the faith in this new trial. His care and zeal extended to places at a distance, as well as to his own immediate charge. We have a long admirable letter from him addressed to the people of Thibaris, which sounds still like the voice of a heavenly trumpet, calling upon men to forsake all joyfully for Christ. He sees the fashion of the world passing away, the last time evidently at hand, the power of Antichrist ready to appear in full revelation ; and finds in all this only the stronger reason for renouncing its expectations in every form, and making full earnest with the promise of life and immortality contained in the Gospel. Let persecutions come. They were to be expected.

They had been foretold. They grow necessarily out of the relation the church bears to the world. They serve to promote our fellowship with Christ; who bids us rejoice and exult accordingly, when we are called thus to suffer for his name. Why? "Because when persecutions have place, then crowns of faith are given, then the soldiers of God are proved, then heaven is opened to the martyrs." Let God be glorified by death or by flight—the leaving of all for the Saviour's name. Exile in such form involved no real separation from the church. He is not alone who, wherever he wanders or hides in mountains or dismal deserts, has Christ always for his companion. And should he fall, by robber or wild beast, by hunger or thirst or cold, or by storm at sea, it will be still under his leader's eye, a merit sure to find from him its promised reward in the resurrection. "The glory of martyrdom is not less for its being out of public view, if only it be death really for the Saviour's sake. Enough that it be attested by that one witness, who awards to martyrs their final plaudit and crown." Then follow the animating examples of righteous Abel, the first martyr, of Abraham called to sacrifice his son Isaac, of the three youth whom Nebuchadnezar cast into the fiery furnace, and of others mentioned in sacred history, whose faith it should be counted a privilege to follow in the same path to everlasting glory. In the end, victory must declare itself on the side of Christ, and shame and defeat be the portion of all who should join hands with Antichrist and the world. He that loveth his life must lose it, while to hate it in this world was to save it forever. "Men are trained and exercised for secular contests, and count it greatly to their honor if it may fall to them to be crowned before a multitude of spectators and in the presence of the emperor. See what a grand and sublime contest, glorious by the reward of a celestial crown, is here, that God should behold us striving, and take a lively interest in the spectacle of our struggle, following with his eyes those whom he has deigned to make his own sons. While we fight and do battle for the faith, God beholds, his angels behold, Christ also beholds. What weight of glory is it, and what vast happiness, to contend in the presence of God, and to be crowned by Christ as Judge! Let us arm ourselves, dearly beloved brethren, with all our strength, and prepare for the contest with pure mind, sound faith, and devoted resolution. Let the camp of God move forward to the battle, to which we are summoned. Let the sound arm themselves, that none such may lose their past integrity. Let the lapsed also arm themselves, that such may recover what has been lost. Let the sound be provoked to bat-

ble by honor, the lapsed by grief. The blessed apostle Paul exhorts us to arm and prepare in this way, when he says: 'We wrestle not against flesh and blood, &c.' (Eph. vi: 12-17). These arms let us take, with these spiritual and heavenly defences let us fortify ourselves, that we may be able to withstand and repel in the evil day the assaults of the Devil." Then follows a glowing picture of the final triumph of the saints, in contrast with the fearful doom of all rebels and traitors, after which the epistle concludes: "Let these things, dearly beloved brethren, sink into our hearts. Let this be the preparation of our arms, this our meditation day and night, to keep before our eyes, and to revolve in thought and feeling continually, the punishments of the wicked and the rewards and merits of the just, what the Lord threatens in the way of penalty to those who deny him, and what on the other hand he promises to those who confess him in the way of glory. Should the day of persecution overtake us in the midst of such thoughts and meditations, the soldier of Christ, instructed by his precepts and admonitions, will not quail from battle, but be ready for the crown."

The tract *De Exhortatione Martyrii*, addressed to Fortunatus, is a general encouragement to martyrdom, in like earnest and vigorous strain, made up mainly of texts and examples drawn from the Holy Scriptures. It is not enough in this war to be summoned to battle by man's voice; the precepts and promises of God, as they are to be found in his own word, need to be well laid up and continually revolved in the mind. These are the sounds of the trumpet, that inspire the soldier with his best courage, and most surely conduct him to victory. Of such force however the Scriptures are to Cyprian's mind, as a matter of course, only in the bosom of the Church. As we have seen before, martyrdom itself had no value in his eyes, no proper reality we may say, under any other view. The subject is presented under a succession of leading heads, such as: That the idols of the heathen are no gods; That God only is to be worshipped; God's threatenings against such as sacrifice to idols, &c. Sufferings and persecutions are shown to be the natural lot of the righteous and pious. But Christ is greater and stronger than the world; he can sustain his people here, and he will bring them to everlasting glory hereafter—an exceeding weight of glory that may well cause all suffering and affliction in this world to appear by comparison insignificant and light. Then comes the stirring peroration: "If it be glorious for secular soldiers, after the enemy has been conquered, to come back with triumph into their country, how much more great and illustrious

is it to return triumphing, from the defeat of Satan, into Paradise; and there, from whence Adam the sinner was once cast out, to bring back victorious trophies by the prostration of him who before caused such ruinous fall; to offer unto God his most acceptable sacrifice of incorruptible faith and inward virtue without blemish; to attend him, with illustrious devotion, when he shall come to take vengeance on his enemies; to stand by his side, when he shall sit in judgment; to be joint heir with Christ; to be made equal with the angels; to rejoice, with patriarchs, with apostles, with prophets, in the profession of the heavenly kingdom! Such thoughts what persecution can conquer, what torments overcome? The mind which is settled by religious meditations remains fixed and firm, and no terrors of the Devil, no threats of the world, can shake the soul that is made strong by the sure and steady faith of things to come. The world is shut in persecutions, but heaven is thrown open. Antichrist threatens, but Christ defends. Death comes, but immortality follows. Earth disappears to the slain, but paradise meets the restored. Temporal life is extinguished, but life eternal takes its place. What dignity is it, and what security, to depart hence joyfully, to depart gloriously in the midst of affliction and pain, to close at one moment the eyes that look upon men and the world, and to open them the next on God and on Christ! How rapid so bright a transition! You are hurried suddenly from below, to rest in glory above. Lay hold of these things; think of them day and night. Found in such frame by the day of persecution, the soldier of God will be fully prepared for battle. Or if called away before, the faith which was thus prepared for martyrdom will not lose its reward. Where God is judge, merit hangs not on the accident of time. In persecution martyrdom is crowned, in peace the martyr's mind."

The bishops of Rome, under the immediate eye of the emperors, were naturally the first object always of imperial persecution. The see was filled almost wholly, for three centuries, by a succession of martyrs. Cornelius, who had entered on the office at the risk of his life under Decius, was now banished, and afterwards condemned to death. Lucius, his courageous successor, soon shared the same fate. We have a letter from Cyprian to Cornelius on the occasion of his good confession, which breathes the martyr's spirit, burns with the martyr's fire, we might almost say in every line. "We have learned the glorious proofs of your faith and virtue, dearest brother," he writes, "we have heard of the honor of your confession, with the exultation of those who feel themselves to be partners also."

and sharers of your meritorious praise. For since the church for us is one, and our mind also in undivided harmony, what priest must not triumph in the praises of his fellow priest as though they were his own, or what brotherhood not rejoice in the joy of brethren everywhere? It is not possible fully to express, what exultation and joy there was here, when we were informed of the prosperous and brave course of things among you—that you had led the way there in confession for the brethren, and that the confession of the leader had been swelled by their concurrence, so that in going before to glory you have made many to be companions of your glory, and have engaged the people to become confessors by being first ready to confess for all; leaving us at a loss which most to extol among you, your own ready and firm faith or the unyielding love of the brethren. There was publicly proved the virtue of the bishop going before, with the devotion of the brotherhood cleaving to his steps. As there is among you one mind and one voice, the whole Roman church has confessed.” It was a splendid illustration of the faith which had been commended in the same church long before by the blessed St. Paul; an example full of instruction and encouragement to all churches throughout the world, showing the invincible nature of true Christian unity, where priest and people hold firmly together in the fear of God, and the power it has to prevail in the end over the worst designs of the enemy. The readiness shown by the whole church in this case to make common cause with the confession of the bishop, served to baffle and confound the persecuting power from the very start. Many even who had before fallen now stood firm, deriving strength from their penance, and recovering what had been lost by a glorious confession. The epistle closes with an exhortation of love, in view of what was still to come. “Let us not cease to give ourselves, with all the people, to fastings, watchings, and prayers. Let us be instant in groanings and deprecations. These are the celestial arms for us, which cause us bravely to stand and persevere. These are the spiritual defences and divine weapons, by which we are protected. Let us be mutually mindful of each other, in concord and harmony; let us pray always one for the other; let us relieve our trials and distresses by mutual charity; and which ever of us may first depart hence by the speedy favor of the Lord, let our love continue in his presence, let not prayer cease for our brethren and sisters before the mercy of the Father.”

Here we have a plain recognition of the thought, as one familiar on all sides, that the prayers of the saints in heaven are

not without effect on earth, and that they are to be desired and made account of accordingly, by those who are still in the body, in this view. We meet the same thought at the close of the tract *De Habitu Virginum*: "Mementote tunc nostri, cum incipiet in vobis virginitas coronari."

Persecution served to distinguish, we are told, between the true church and schism pretending to usurp its name. Novatian and his party in Rome were now safe. So in Carthage the faction which was trying to set up a new church under Fortunatus. Antichrist knows his proper enemy, and cares not to waste his strength on those who are already in fact on his own side. "The adversary and foe of the church despises and passes by as conquered captives those whom he has already alienated and led off from the church, and turns his rage against those in whom Christ is seen to dwell." The world would seem indeed in every such case, to have a most quick apprehension in some way of what is and what is not of one spirit with itself. Sects and schisms it can understand. They bring religion into its own sphere, make it a matter of private judgment, place it under the control of human will. That is something to be borne with and endured. It is only the presence of the true *Catholic Church*, with its real heavenly assumptions and powers, and its jurisdiction higher than any which belongs to the kings of the earth, that provokes its hostility and wrath. This the world has no power to comprehend. But it can feel the opposition in which it stands to its own darkness and vanity, and on this ground is ready always to fight against its claims wherever they may be exhibited in their true form.

The plague also made room for a striking argument in favor of the Catholic Church, by bringing the spirit with which it was actuated into lively contrast with the reigning spirit of the world. The fear of death destroyed in the breasts of the heathen all sentiments of kindness and love. Those who could

¹ "Inimicus et hostis ecclesiae, quos alienavit ab ecclesia et foras duxit, ut captivos et victos contemnit et praeterit, eos pergit lacerare in quibus Christum cernit habitare. Quamquam etsi aliquis ex talibus fuerit apprehensus, non est quod sibi quasi in confessione nominis blandiatur, &c." *Ep. 60, ad Cornelium*. So again, *Ep. 61, ad Lucium*, the persecution in Rome is said to have been Divinely intended to distinguish the true church from the false and to confound heretics by showing which cause the Devil was disposed to destroy and which to spare. "Neque enim persequitur et impugnat Christi adversarius nisi castra et milites Christi; haereticos prostratos semel et suos factos contemnit et praeterit. Illos quaerit dejicere, quos videt stare."

fled, to save their own lives. The sick were abandoned, in the most merciless style, to their hard fate. The dying, and the dead, were cast out upon the highways and streets. On all sides corpses were left unburied, poisoning the air still more with their pestilential putrefaction. A sort of desperation ruled the public mind; which however, instead of bringing men to acknowledge their sins and humble themselves in the way of religion, led many rather to blaspheme the only true religion itself as being the cause of this sore calamity, as well as of the other public miseries of the time. In these circumstances, Cyprian published two tracts; one, *De Mortalitate*, designed to instruct and animate Christians in their duty; the other, *Ad Demetrianum*, in the way of apology and defence over against this mad charge of the Pagan world. The effect of the first, along with the other exhortations of the chief pastor, backed by his own brave and noble example, seems to have been all that could have been wished or desired. The faltering were made firm, while the strong were inspired with new resolution and zeal. Not only did the Christians take care of their own sick, and show becoming regard to their own dead; but in the spirit of that heroic, self-sacrificing and self-forgetting charity, which no other religion save that of the cross has ever been able to inspire, they took upon them the care also of others. "If we are the children of God," said Cyprian to his people, "who causes his sun to shine and sends rain upon the just and unjust, not confining his gifts and benefits to his own merely, but extending to those also who are alienated from him in the spirit of their mind, we must show it in act and deed, endeavoring to be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect, by blessing those that curse us and doing good to those by whom we are persecuted." The church resolved itself, accordingly, into an organization of mercy and charity for the whole city. The rich made generous contributions in money; the poor lent their personal service. The sick, who had been abandoned by their heathen relatives and friends, were taken in and nursed at the risk of life. The streets were cleared of exposed corpses, and the air relieved from contagion, by their proper burial. Thus did the church heap coals of fire on the head of her enemy. The Pagan world looked on with astonishment, and for the moment at least was forced to admire what it had no power rightly to comprehend.¹

¹ Compare with this the following picture, which has been preserved to us from Dionysius of Alexandria, in a notice of the plague that prevailed

The tract *De Mortalitate* has regard specially to the miseries of its own age ; which Cyprian felt to be in a certain sense the consummation of the world's vanity, making room for the full advent of Antichrist, and so for the final collapse and fall of its whole present state, in the way of preparation for the second coming of Christ. The relation of the world, however, this present *saeculum*, the order of nature as such, to the economy of grace and the true kingdom of God, is always substantially the same. It remains always equally true, that the scheme or fashion of this world passeth away ; that it is in itself a shadow and a dream ; that the proper destiny of man lies beyond it, in a form which he is now required to embrace by faith ; that this involves and requires necessarily the solemn renunciation of the life that now is for that which is to come ; that those who thus set faith above sense must be hated, and charged with folly, by the mass of men who have no faith, but are bent on living only for the present time ; that such moral disorder on the part of the world, added to its natural vanity, and attended with special judgments on the part of God, must make it always a scene of discipline and trial for the righteous ; and that the only proper posture and habit of the believer, therefore, is that by which he is led to look upon it as a state that is ever rushing towards its own dissolution, and to wait for the revelation of the Son of God from heaven, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints and admired in all them that believe. In such view, the tract before us is of eloquent application and force for all times. These are the topics in substance, on which it dwells. Let the soldiers of the cross consider well the terms of their warfare.

in that city some years later, in the reign of the Emperor Gallien : " The visitation filled the heathen with the utmost dismay, as an evil that left no hope ; but it had no such terror for us, to whom it came only as a special discipline and probation. The most of our brethren spared not themselves in the fulness of their brotherly love, but cared only for one another, and by attending upon the sick without regard to their own safety, serving them willingly for Christ's sake, showed themselves ready to give their lives for them if need be with joy. Many died, after they had restored others by their care. The best among us, a number of presbyters, deacons, and distinguished laymen, ended their lives in this way—a form of death, which seems, as the fruit of great piety and vigorous faith, not to fall short of the glory of martyrdom itself. Many handled the bodies of dying Christian brethren, closed their mouths and eyes, buried them with all decency and respect, and then followed them in death. Among the heathen, all was different. Those who took sick were thrust out ; the dearest friends were forsaken ; the dying were exposed in the street ; the dead were left unburied."

They are called to meet trials. These show that the world is passing away, and that the kingdom of heaven is at hand. We live by faith. Why should we not be ready joyfully to quit this life, if God calls, full as it is of temptation and sorrow—unless it be because the glorious promises of God concerning the life to come, are not firmly believed? While in the body, Christians are necessarily under the same law of suffering with others. Nay, they must endure more than the common world. This is part of their discipline; which is to be met with corresponding humility and patience; and which is to make room finally for their victory and crown. The plague should be terrible only to such as were not “born again of water and the Spirit,” who stood exposed thus to the second death. To the servants of God, death in any form was to be counted salvation. When such were called away, it was not proper that their friends should mourn as those who had no hope—“clothing themselves in black garments here, for those who are now arrayed there in white.” Let the heathen see, that we really believe what we say, and do not mourn as lost those whom we profess to regard as living with God. Death is the necessary passage to immortality. Who should not desire to be thus transformed into the image of the Saviour and translated into his glory? Let those seek to stay in the world, on whom the world smiles, and who make it their confidence and life. *Our* rest and hope are not here. We have here no abiding city, but seek one to come. Now especially all may be said to urge us forwards and upwards in our thoughts. The world is evidently tottering towards its own fall. The sorrows of the last time are near at hand. To die now, is for the righteous emphatically to be taken away from the evil to come. Let us welcome such deliverance then, as strangers and pilgrims anxious to reach their proper home. “Paradise we consider our country, the patriarchs are our parents; and why should we not hasten forward to behold the first and salute the last? A vast collection of friends await us there; a large crowd of parents, brothers, sons, secure now of their own salvation but anxious still for ours, expect our presence. To meet and embrace these, what joy will it be on both sides! What will be the pleasure of those celestial regions, without the fear of dying, felicity supreme in a life without end! There will be the glorious choir of the apostles, there the exulting company of the prophets, there the innumerable throng of martyrs crowned for the victory of their conflict and passion, there the triumphat virgins which subdued the concupiscence of the flesh and body by the power of continence, there the merciful in the

possession of their reward, who performed works of righteousness by their alms and gifts to the poor, and following the Lord's directions converted their earthly patrimony into treasures in heaven. To these, beloved brethren, let us hasten with ardent desire; let it be our wish, that we may reach there soon, that we may soon be with Christ. Let God behold in us this mind, let Christ the Lord see such to be the purpose of our faith, who may be expected to bestow the rewards of his glory most largely on those who have had towards him the strongest desires."

The tract addressed to *Demetrianus* is written with like animation, and in a similar tone of firm and vigorous faith. It is a bold apology for Christianity over against the charges of this insulting representative of heathenism, in which the vanity and misery of the reigning Pagan life are brought out with unmerciful exposure, and the solemn truths of the Gospel proclaimed in opposition to it with Elijah-like severity and zeal. Again we have the idea of the world in its decrepitude and old age, a system now ready to pass away. War, dearth, famine, pestilence, were all in order for such a state of palpable decay. They had been foretold, as signs of the approaching end of the world. They were however, at the same time, signs of Divine wrath. God was angry with the heathen world for its sins. What right had those to complain of his judgments, who wearied him with their provocations. "Ye are angry at God's anger; as though ye had merited something good by your bad lives; as though all your calamities were not still less in number and more light than your sins." Then follows a scathing censure of the reigning manners of the time, revealing to us a gloomy insight into the social state of the old Roman world in these last days of its life and power. And now as if all other crimes were not enough, the guilt must be added to them of persecuting the servants of the Most High. All other forms of religion they could tolerate; only not the service of the true God. "Crocodiles, and baboons, and stones, and serpents, are worshipped by you; God alone is either not worshipped anywhere, or else worshipped at risk of punishment. The innocent, the righteous, the friends of God, ye deprive of their home, rob of their patrimony, load with chains, cast into prison, deliver to the sword, to wild beasts, to flames. Neither are ye content to inflict upon us such pains in any simple and compendious form. Protracted torments are applied to our racked bodies, manifold excruciations to our lacerated bowels; your savage inhumanity is not satisfied with ordinary forms of torture; it becomes a matter of ingenuity to excogitate such as new." What lust of cruelty? What gratui-

tous rage? In other cases, torture was applied to draw out confession. But here the confession was offered freely, and yet the torture was made to follow; showing plainly what diabolical spirit ruled and governed the whole process. "But why turn to the infirmity of the body? Why contend with the imbecillity of mortal flesh? Engage with the power of the soul, assail the force of the mind, overthrow faith, conquer by disputation if you can, conquer with reason. Or if there be anything of divinity and power in your gods, let *them* rise in their own cause, and defend themselves by their own majesty." But the impotency of these gods was shown, in the power which Christians had over them, through the name of Christ, in the cure of demoniacal possessions. On the other hand, God is the avenger of his people, and all who are his enemies must perish. There may seem to be indeed in this world; one lot to the righteous with the wicked; but it is only in appearance. The calamities which come upon the last as a curse only, are to the first a source of discipline and so of salvation. The issue in the one case is eternal death, while in the other it is everlasting life. Let the enemies of the Church then be warned in time, and seek salvation before it be forever too late. Let them come forth from the deep night of superstition into the clear light of day. "We grudge not your good, and hoard not up for ourselves the Divine gift. We return kindness for your hatred; and for the pains and torments you inflict upon us, we show unto you the way of salvation. Believe and live, that having persecuted us in time ye may rejoice with us in eternity. When this world is left, there is no room for penitence, no force in satisfaction. Here life is either lost or gained." Here repentance is never too late; and no one need despair of salvation, who even at the last hour applies to God with a true heart for mercy.

Another interesting exemplification of Christian charity on the part of Cyprian and his church, is presented to us about the same time in their cheerful and liberal response to a call that was made upon them from Numidia, for the relief a heavy calamity which had befallen the churches in that country. In an irruption of some neighboring barbarous tribe, a number of Christians, of both sexes, were carried away into captivity; and a sum of money was now required for their ransom, which the poverty of the Numidian churches found itself unable to raise. Letters were sent to Carthage, reporting the case and imploring help. We have Cyprian's epistle in reply, (*Ep. 62, ad Januarium et al.*), full of the most tender sympathy and concern. "With the greatest inward commotion," he writes, "and not

without tears, we have read what you have written to us, dear brethren, in the solicitude of your love, concerning the captivity of our brethren and sisters. For who must not grieve in such a case, who must not reckon the calamity of his brother to be his own, when the Apostle Paul says: 'If one member suffer, &c.' (1 Cor. xii: 26); and in another place: 'Who is weak and I am not weak' (2 Cor. xi: 29). So now the captivity of our brethren is to be considered *our* captivity also, and the affliction of those in danger is to be regarded as our affliction; since we are united in truth in one body, and not love merely, but religion also should excite and engage us to ransom brethren who are our members. For since the Apostle Paul again says: 'Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you' (1 Cor. iii: 16), if even love were not enough, to urge us to the help of our brethren, we should yet reflect in this case that they are temples of God which are carried away captive, and that we ought not patiently to endure the long continuance of such disgrace, but should lay out actively and promptly such strength as we have, to deserve well by our service of Christ our Divine Lord and Judge. For whereas the Apostle Paul says: 'As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ' (Gal. iii: 27), we are to see in our captive brethren Christ himself, and to redeem from the peril of captivity Him who has redeemed us from the peril of death; that he who has rescued us from the jaws of the Devil, and who abides and dwells in us, may now himself be rescued from the hands of barbarians, and he be redeemed by a sum of money who has redeemed us by the cross and by blood; who moreover allows this to happen, that our faith may be tried, whether each one is ready to do for another what he would wish to be done for himself, if he were himself a captive in the hands of barbarians." With many thanks for the opportunity given to participate in so good a work, the epistle then goes on to state, that the case had been laid before the church in Carthage, and that a collection had been readily and freely made amounting to a "hundred thousand sesterces," (several thousand dollars,) which was now forwarded to the Numidian bishops, to be applied as they might see proper to the object in view. The wish is expressed that no similar calamity might again occur; but it is nobly added at the same time: "If however anything of the sort *should* take place, to prove our love and try our faith, fail not to inform us of it at once by letter, as you rest assured that, whilst our whole church and brotherhood here pray that no such event may happen, they are ready in case it should to contribute

large and liberal aid." In conclusion another feature of this early Christianity comes into view, which is not undeserving of our thoughtful notice: "That our brethren and sisters who have contributed heartily and freely to this necessary work, as they are ready to do always, may be had in mind in your prayers, and a recompense be made them for their good deed in your *sacrifices and supplications*, I have subjoined their several names; as I have added also the names of certain of our colleagues in the priesthood, who being present have also contributed something in their own name and in that of their people according to their ability—noting and forwarding also their amounts besides our own proper remittance; all of whom, as faith and charity demand, ye are bound to remember in your offices of prayer."

The persecution under Gallus proved after all less serious than was apprehended. Wars and insurrections, throughout his reign, gave him no time to carry it vigorously forward in the provinces; and his death, which took place by violence in the summer of a. 253, brought it altogether to an end. For a few years subsequently, the Church was permitted to enjoy again general rest and peace.

It was towards the close of this period, that the unhappy controversy arose concerning the baptism of heretics, of which we have already taken some notice. As we have seen before, it grew entirely out of the high view which then universally prevailed of the Divine nature of the Church, as being the body of Christ, and thus the one only medium of salvation for a guilty and fallen world. All saving grace for men was held to be by the action of the Spirit, not as influencing their minds in what may be called a general natural way, but only as comprehended in this supernatural constitution, made to be historically present in the world under such outward and real form. Here was the mystery precisely, which faith, as distinguished from sense and natural reason, was required to own and embrace in the Holy Catholic Church—a new world of light and power namely, by the resurrection of Christ, actually at hand through the Holy Ghost for all the purposes of man's redemption and sanctification. In the bosom of this heavenly constitution, it was held, and nowhere else in the wide world, there was "power on earth to forgive sins." Here the Apostolic commission was still in full force, carrying along with it corresponding endowments and prerogatives of grace. Here were real sacraments, not shadows merely but types. Here accordingly baptism by water, was at the same time baptism by the Holy Ghost, answerable in full to

our Saviour's word to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." It was for the remission of sins, and carried in it the mystery of a new birth to righteousness and salvation. Such force the sacrament was considered to have, of course, not as a mechanical or magical charm, not in virtue of its own outward form merely nakedly and separately taken, but in union only with the supernatural life of the Church, in which is comprehended the presence of the Spirit and the fulness of the new creation. From this it would seem naturally to follow, that it could never be validly administered on the outside of the church, and that the baptism of heretics and schismatics, therefore, must be rejected as of no force.

This view in fact gained wide ground in different parts of the church. It prevailed particularly in Asia Minor and Northern Africa. In Rome however it was all along held, that such baptism might be valid, and that it was not necessary therefore to baptize over again in all cases those who came from heretical associations into the true church. For some time the question was not brought to any decision. Each region was allowed to follow quietly its own tradition and custom. But now, in the middle of the third century, the difference broke out into an open and violent controversy, the result of which was a complete rupture for a season between the see of Rome and those portions of the church which stood opposed to it in this dispute.

Towards the end of the year 253, the Roman bishop Stephen went so far as to place the churches of Asia Minor under sentence of excommunication, on the charge of their being Anabaptists, in insisting as they did on the re-baptism of heretics. From Asia the difficulty soon after extended itself to Northern Africa. Cyprian entered with zeal into the Asiatic view, and in doing so was brought at once into full collision with the Roman pontiff. Two councils, the first composed of eighteen and the second of seventy-one bishops, were held at Carthage in the year 255, which united in the declaration that the baptism of heretics was not to be regarded as valid. We have several letters from Cyprian on the subject, some of them quite long, all taking the same ground and breathing the same earnest and decided tone. Among the rest, one to Stephen himself, reporting to him respectfully but firmly the judgment of the larger Carthaginian council.

The argument is always of one form. All grace resides in the church; heretics and schismatics are on the outside of this sacred communion; consequently they have not the Spirit; and

how then can they confer any spiritual benefit on others? Their sacraments must be, like themselves, false and void. It is not enough to say, that the Spirit is given afterwards, by confirmation or the imposition of hands, when any of them are received into the true church. It belongs to the idea of baptism, that this sacrament itself should include the grace of the Spirit; "for remission of sins is granted to every one in baptism, and the declaration of our Lord in the Gospel shows that sins can be remitted by those only who have the Holy Spirit; since when he sent forth his disciples after his resurrection, saying, 'As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you,' we are told that he breathed on them, and said: 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whose soever ye retain they are retained.' This proves, that he only can baptize and give remission of sins, who may have the Holy Ghost." How then can the baptism of heretics carry with it any force, (Ep. 69)? "How shall he be able to give remission of sins to another, who himself has no power to put off his own sins, as being out of the church?" The interrogation made in baptism involves clearly this sense; "for when we say, 'Dost thou believe in life eternal and the remission of sins by the holy church?' it is understood that the remission of sins is not given except in the church, and that with heretics, where the church is not, sins cannot be discharged. Let those then who assert that heretics can baptize either change the interrogation, or else vindicate its truth—unless they allow them the church also, for whom they thus claim baptism." Along with baptism must go also the holy chrism or anointing with consecrated oil. "But there can be no sanctification of creature oil, where there is neither altar nor church" (Ep. 70).

It is easy enough to see, that Cyprian has in his eye always the position taken by Stephen and the Roman church, and that he feels it to be more than anything else in his way. He has to allow too, that this had the weight of previous custom and tradition in its favor. The contrary view, in Africa at least, had begun to acquire authority only about the close of the previous century, and was still not universally received. So far as previous practice is appealed to in this case accordingly, it is for the purpose only of establishing a provincial liberty, the right of following a special usage and custom; while pains are taken, in a way which seems to be almost Protestant at times, to break the authority of the older and more general tradition, by an appeal to what is taken to be the voice of reason and the clear sense of the Gospel. The old usage, it is supposed, may have grown out

of the fact, that those who went off in the first heresies and schisms had been previously baptized in the church, and so did not need to be baptized over again if they afterwards returned to its bosom. It became an abuse, only when the same rule was extended to such as had their first baptism with heretics, which was to be considered in truth no baptism at all. "We are not to go by custom however, but by force of reason. For even Peter, whom the Lord chose to be first and on whom he built his church, when Paul afterwards contended with him about circumcision, did not arrogate anything to himself with insolent assumption, so as to say that he held the primacy and ought rather to have deference from such as came after him, neither did he despise Paul because he had once been a persecutor of the church, but admitted the counsel of truth, and readily yielded to right reason as vindicated by Paul; leaving us thus a lesson of concord and patience, that we may not pertinaciously cleave to our own mind, but may embrace and make to be our own rather what is usefully and wholesomely suggested at times by our brethren and colleagues, if it be found true and right" (Ep. 71). This looks to Stephen, and may be considered pretty free in its manner of dealing with his pontifical claims; but it is not hard to see that it carries in it notwithstanding a silent acknowledgment of the truth of these claims. It is not a protest against authority absolutely in the name of reason, but a plea rather which seeks to bend authority to reason as its proper rule. "In vain do they who are vanquished by reason oppose custom to us," it is said in another place (Ep. 72) "as though custom were greater than truth, or that were not to be followed in spiritual things which is revealed for the better by the Holy Spirit." Error in ignorance may be pardoned, as it was in the case of St Paul; but to continue in it, after the truth has been made clear, is obstinacy without excuse. Such passages have it must be confessed a sufficiently independent sound, and may seem at first not to be in full harmony with Cyprian's general theory of the church. But we are bound in common justice to take them in connection with this theory; and when we do so, they will be found to assert after all nothing more than this, that the authority of the church in its own sphere ought to be governed by a proper regard to the nature of things, and not simply by blind custom. To suppose that the author of the tract *De Unitate Ecclesiae* could seriously intend, for one moment, to set up private judgment as such in any case of this sort against the whole idea of church authority, or to make any particular and separate construction of the original sense of

Christianity of more force than the tradition of the church itself in its absolute and fully settled form, is perfectly absurd. The more so too, we may add, as the object of Cyprian's zeal here was itself only a sort of corollary always in his mind from that very doctrine of the church, which he would be made by this supposition to hold in so poor account.

With like qualification must we take those passages, in which he seems to assert the right of every bishop to follow in his own diocese any practice which to himself may seem best, under responsibility to God alone at the last day. So Ep. 69, *ad Magnum*, he gives his judgment, imposing it however on no one, "as each overseer must give account of his conduct to the Lord, as the blessed Paul writes: 'Every one of us shall give account of himself to God; let us not therefore judge one another any more,' (Rom. xiv: 12, 13)." Again Ep. 72, to Stephen himself: "These things, very dear brother, we have reported to you, both out of official regard and from private affection, believing that you too, in the sincerity of your piety and faith, will be pleased with what is agreeable at once to both piety and truth. We know however, that some are not willing to lay aside what they have once imbibed, and cannot easily change their own mind, but without prejudice to the bond of peace and concord with their colleagues choose to retain certain peculiarities which have become established for themselves by use. In which matter also neither do we pretend to coerce any one or to create law, since every bishop in the government of the church has the free use of his own will, under responsibility for what he does to the Lord." Again, Ep. 72, *ad Jubaianum*: "These things, dear brother, we have written to you, after our mediocrity, not prescribing or prejudging for any one, so as that every bishop may not do what he thinks best, having free power of his own will. We, so far as in us lies, do not quarrel for the sake of heretics with our colleagues and fellow bishops, with whom we hold concord and peace in the Lord; more especially as the apostle says, 'If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the church of God' (1 Cor. xi: 16). Patiently and mildly we maintain the spirit of charity, the honor of our college, the bond of faith and concord of the priesthood." To infer from all this, that Cyprian considered every bishop absolutely independent in his own charge, would be ridiculously foolish. The office for him had no force in any case, except in union with the organization of the church as a single whole. All he can mean here then is, that within this acknowledged general jurisdiction, and under the condition of being true to its

proper authority, however this might be exercised, each member of the episcopal college was to be regarded as an independent functionary, at liberty to manage his particular trust as to himself should appear best. This question concerning the baptism of heretics accordingly he affects to look upon as one not yet absolutely settled, as one that should for the present be left open; in the case of which, at the same time he trusts, that what he takes to be the necessary sense of the true doctrine of the church, would yet be able to triumph in the end over all contrary present usage, if only it were not pretended now to force it to a general public decision. What he is provoked with in Stephen's conduct, is that he should insist on taking the point out of the sphere of freedom, and be bent on turning it into fixed law, in a form which was supposed not to express fairly at last the true mind of the church and the proper sense of the Christian tradition.

Be this as it might however, Stephen refused to recede from the ground he had already been led to take, in opposition to the churches of Asia Minor. With the delegates which were sent to him by the African council he refused to have any conference whatever, and even directed his people not to receive them into their houses, by way of testifying his displeasure with the cause they represented. Cyprian's letter was answered; but only to let him know that the position he had taken was wrong. "Let there be no innovation," it was said, "on the rule handed down, that such as come from heretical bodies should be received by imposition of hands only to repentance." Cyprian speaks of the communication as proud and self-contradictory (Ep. 74, *ad Pompeium*); but he was not in the right posture and mood exactly, to judge fairly in the case; it may have been simply strong and firm in its tone, while it refused to reason on the subject, but cut the whole question short by the stern plea of usage and tradition.

Another council, consisting of seventy-eight bishops, was convened in Carthage towards the close of the year 256, which in the face of this Roman decision solemnly re-affirmed the previous judgment of the African church.¹ The difficulty was carried thus to an actual and open breach of ecclesiastical peace.

¹ In the introduction to the proceedings of this synod, from Cyprian's pen, it is said with plain reference to Stephen: "Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se esse episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adijit, quando habeat omnis episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suae arbitrium proprium tamque

In these circumstances, it became an object with Cyprian to have a common understanding with the churches of Asia Minor. A special communication on the subject was made accordingly to Firmilian of Cesarea in Cappadocia, one of the leading bishops of that region; which drew forth in return the celebrated letter of this prelate preserved among Cyprian's writings. It makes common cause of course with the African bishops; echoes the sentiments and arguments of Cyprian; and speaks at the same time in the most disrespectful terms of the course pursued by Stephen. Over against the Roman plea of tradition, it is maintained that the strong terms of reprobation employed by the apostles towards heretics show plainly that they could not have admitted the validity of their baptism, and that the alleged contrary custom therefore must have crept in without right, and so should not now be allowed to contravene what was manifestly the true sense of the Gospel. The Roman tradition in some other points also was not strictly apostolical, as might be seen in its variation from what was observed at Jerusalem; so in other provinces local peculiarities of worship were to be found; which however disturbed not the proper unity of the church; an evil now forced upon it by the intolerance of Stephen, which of itself showed this tradition human only and not Divine. In Asia, they had always followed the other practice. One church and so only one baptism, had been their maxim. To admit baptism on the outside of the true church, was in the end to suppose other real churches also besides that founded on Peter, and so to turn into a farce the very primacy of which Stephen was now disposed to make such high-handed use. This was to be worse than the heretics themselves, by keeping them back from the laver of regeneration, and withholding from them the remission of sins, even when they were led to renounce their errors and to seek salvation as something which is to be found only in the church. And yet the Roman pontiff must be offended. The patron of heretics, God's enemies, is indignant with those who oppose them and maintain the truth of the church! Hence what strifes and dissensions has he not brought to pass? "But what sin haet

judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest alium judicare. Sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus et solus habet potestatem et praeponendi nos in ecclesiae suae gubernatione et de actu nostro judicandi." This is carrying the tone of episcopal independence very far indeed; but the nature of the case requires, that it should still be taken with the general qualification to which we have already referred.

thou not accumulated on thyself, in cutting thyself off from so many flocks! For it is thyself thou has excinded, be well assured; since he is the true schismatic, who makes himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity. For in pretending to cut off all from thy communion thou hast only put thyself out of communion with all." What a specimen of evangelical charity and humility! A fine way truly to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace—thus to make common cause with heretics, and break with the household of faith in all parts of the world! To refuse all negotiation on the subject with the delegates of a sister province! "To call Cyprian besides a pseudo-christian, a pseudo-apostle, and a deceitful workman!"

The letter is deeply tinged with passion throughout. All is discolored, distorted and exaggerated, by the medium of excited feeling and partizan interest through which it is viewed. We see in it not so much Stephen's real spirit, or his real behavior, as the construction put upon both by the offended humor of Firmilian. Stephen never certainly applied any such abusive epithets to Cyprian. Firmilian merely construes in this way, after the fashion of heated brains, the pontiff's general procedure. It amounted to this, he means, in its virtual import; as one may flare up, when he is contradicted in some opinion by another, and say: "Do you then call me a *liar*?" This one specimen is enough to show, with how much caution and reserve the statements generally of such a witness are to be received, in this unfortunate case. It is to be regretted, that the whole controversy is set before us only under an *ex parte* and completely onesided representation. We have no version of the affair from the side of Stephen. If we had, it would no doubt be made to appear in a very different light.

As it is, the whole case tells strongly in favor of the supremacy of the Roman see, and not against it as is sometimes pretended. How came Stephen to assert such authority, in opposition to whole provinces of the church east and west, if it were not on the ground of previously acknowledged prerogative and right? Or how could the pretension do more than call forth derision, if no such ground existed for it in fact in the general mind of the church? It is easy to talk of his presumption and pride, and of a regular system of usurpation kept up with success on the part of the Roman pontiffs generally. But that is simply to beg the whole question in dispute. The hypothesis is too violent. It destroys itself. Stephen was neither fool nor knave; and yet he must have been both on a grand scale, to play the part he did here out of mere wanton ambition, usurping powers to which

he himself well knew, as all the world knew besides, he had no lawful claim whatever. Both Cyprian and Firmilian are themselves witnesses in fact, that a true central authority did belong to the bishop of Rome. What they complain of is its supposed abuse. They feel the force of it very plainly in spite of themselves. This is just what makes them so restive under its exercise. Had it been mere false pretension, they could have afforded to let it pass by them as the idle wind. They knew it however to be more than that. Then again, it turned out in the end that Stephen was in truth right. His judgment proved to be, with proper distinctions afterwards, the real voice of the Catholic Church, and has remained in full force down to the present time. There is reason to believe too, that it includes deep wisdom, that it is of vast practical importance, and that it was highly necessary at the same time to have the case settled in this way. Even those who are most ready to resolve the whole proceeding into the worst motives, are constrained generally to admit all this in its favor. But now what makes the case most of all remarkable perhaps, is the way in which so wise and correct a decision was reached. It was not by any theological speculation. It must be granted, that there seemed to be much more reason in the view taken of the subject by Cyprian. To this day it is by no means easy to answer his general argument. It would appear to lie really in the conception of the church, as it was then universally held, that no baptism on the outside of its visible communion could be valid; and that to pretend the contrary must necessarily bring into peril the entire doctrine, as an article of faith. And yet just this seeming contradiction the judgment of Stephen, setting at full defiance the cogency of the reasoning employed on the other side, is made to embrace. Not however through any more profound analysis of the Christian theory. Nothing of that sort was pretended. All was made to turn on tradition. The wisdom of the decision, whatever it might be, lay altogether in the tact, with which what was taken to be the true sense of the Church in this form was discerned and affirmed, in distinction from all merely accidental variations with which it might have been observed in particular places. On this ground only the whole judgment was made to rest. Stephen acted in the case, not as a legislator, but simply as a judge expounding the common law of the church. This is truly characteristic, and forms one of the most interesting features of the whole transaction.

How far Cyprian may have been deserving of blame in this affair, we shall not pretend to give any opinion. Augustine,

who was his great admirer, and who in a certain sense carried out his doctrine of the Church to its proper scientific perfection, considers that he fell here into serious fault; which he trusts however was surmounted by his better mind afterwards, as it may be said to have been fully washed out at last by his glorious martyrdom. Of his honesty and pure zeal for the glory of God, no one can have any doubt. It is easy enough to see also, that the controversy gave him no small amount of uneasiness and grief.

In the midst of it, as he himself informs us in his epistle to Jubaianus, he wrote his tract *De Bono Patientiae*.¹ It is an exhortation to endure manfully the sorrows and trials of life, enforced by the general long-suffering of God, and by the particular pattern of Christ, as well as by the example of the patriarchs, prophets, and saints of every age, who have borne his image and walked in his spirit. 'The world in any view is full of vanity and grief; our present mortal state is by reason of sin a discipline of affliction throughout. All need to arm themselves with patience for the battle of life. But how much more the followers of Christ, who in addition to those natural evils were required to meet special tribulations on account of their faith; who were exposed to special and extraordinary assaults of the Devil; "who, besides other manifold and various temptations, were called upon, by the dreadful stress of persecution, to forsake their property, to undergo imprisonment, to bear chains, to put life at stake, to endure the sword, wild beasts, flames, crucifixion, in a word all sorts of torments and pains, by faith and the virtue of patience—according to the word of the Lord: 'These things have I spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace; in the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world' (John xvi: 33)."' All true patience springs from a firm apprehension of the reality and glory of the life to come. We are saved by hope. God reigns. In the end, all will be right. He who is now silent will in due time be revealed in power and glory, to give rest to his people and to punish his enemies with everlasting destruction. Such is the general strain of this tract, like the music of Ossian, mournful and yet pleasant to the soul. It came in good

¹ Also, as it would seem, the tract entitled *De Zelo et Livore*; which some have supposed to be a sort of practical improvement in some way of the trying experience through which the author was called to pass in this controversy; though without any good reason that we can find, either in the title of the piece or in its contents.

time. The hour for the patience of confessors and martyrs was once more close at hand.

A new persecution broke forth under Valerian in the year 257. The controversy between the bishops of Rome and Carthage was hushed, in their common sufferings for the faith. Stephen had the honor of laying down his life first, with the usual fortune and courage of his exalted see. Cyprian stood prepared in his own mind for the same fate. The persecution however was not at once carried generally to blood. It was hoped that by depriving the congregations of their pastors, and then forbidding them to meet, the object in view might be gained without resorting to this extremity. Cyprian was called before the proconsul Paternus, and required to answer for his faith. "I am a Christian and a bishop," he replied; "I acknowledge only the one true God, who has made heaven and earth and sea, and all that they contain. 'This God we Christians serve; and to Him we pray day and night for ourselves, for all men, and for the welfare of the emperors themselves.'" *Proconsul*: "Do you persist in this purpose?" *Cyprian*: "A good purpose, proceeding from the knowledge of God, may not be changed." The proconsul then pronounced sentence of banishment upon him, according to the imperial edict; and as this had regard to presbyters as well as bishops, he demanded the names of any such then living in Carthage. Cyprian refused to give them; the Roman law, he said, did not allow him to become an informer; neither was it right that they should come forward and report themselves; but let them be sought in the places of their ministry; there they might easily be found. Thus ended this good confession. Cyprian was sent to Curubis; and an order was issued at the same time prohibiting all Christian assemblies, and the common practice of visiting Christian burial places, under penalty of death.

The work of proscription spread throughout Africa. In a short time we find, among other forms of punishment, many thrown into chains, and condemned to labor in the mines—bishops and other ecclesiastics mainly, but along with them also some of the laity, including even females and small boys. From the place of his exile, Cyprian forwarded to these fellow sufferers for the testimony of Jesus a large sum of money, from such means as he had still at command, accompanying the gift with a glowing letter of congratulation and encouragement, which well serves at the same time to show the ardor and courageous zeal of his own mind in the near prospect of martyrdom. For to this issue he now confidently expected to come. He had re-

ceived notice of it in a vision.¹ The oracle however inspired him with no dread. On the contrary, it was to him a source only of joy and strength. The letter to which we have just referred breathes this spirit, in almost every line. "Your glory would require, most blessed and beloved brethren," it begins, "that I should myself come to see and embrace you, were it not that I also am bound as an exile to fixed limits for the confession of the Name. But in such way as I can, I present myself before you; though not with outward bodily approach, yet in affection and spirit I come, expressing by letter the mind with which I triumphantly exult in those virtues and praises which are yours, reckoning myself a partner with you, in the fellowship of love, though not in bodily passion. How indeed can I hold my voice in silence, when I hear of those who are so very dear to me so many glorious things, proceeding from the Divine favor; that a part of you, by the consummation of their martyrdom, should have already gone before to receive from the Lord the crown of their merits; while a part still tarry in the confinement of prisons, or in the mines and chains, furnishing by these very delays a larger amount of example to confirm and animate others, advancing by protracted torments to more ample titles of merit, about to have hereafter for reward celestial compensations answering to the days which are now numbered in pain?" Then, after remarking that such distinction at the end well befitted the exemplary character of their previous Christian life, the epistle goes on: "That you should have been grievously beaten first of all with cudgels, as the beginning of your glorious confession, is not for us a matter of horror. Sticks could not terrify the Christian body, whose whole hope is in the wood. The servant of Christ owns the symbol of his salvation; he who has been by the wood redeemed to eternal life, is here advanced by the wood towards his crown. And what marvel is it that vessels of gold and silver should be yielded to the mines, the place where gold and silver dwell, except that the order is now reversed, so that the mines have begun to receive the precious metals, which they were before wont only to give? They have imposed fetters also on your feet, and have bound your sacred persons, the temples of God, with ignominious chains—

¹ Supernatural communications of this sort, in one form or another, would seem to have been not unfrequent in his experience; and he refers to them, from time to time, in a way which shows them to have been looked upon as by no means out of course in the life of the Church as it then stood.

as if with the body the spirit too might be bound, or your gold could be sullied by the contact of iron. For men dedicated to God, and religiously maintaining the testimony of their faith, these are ornaments, not bonds, the feet of Christians are not put to shame by them, but made illustrious rather for coronation. O feet happily bound, that are to be set free, not by the smith, but by the Lord! O feet happily bound, which move in the way of salvation towards paradise! O feet bound for the present in the world, that they may be free with the Lord forever! O feet held back for a time by fetters and gyves, about to run swiftly with glorious course to Christ! Let cruelty and malice hold you in chains here at their pleasure, soon shall ye pass from the earth and these pains to the realms of heaven. The body is not indulged in the mines with bed and pillows, but it is refreshed with the consolations of Christ. The limbs weary with labor lie on the ground, but it is no punishment to lie there with Christ. The person, externally unwashed and squalid, is the more purified by the Spirit within. There is but little bread there; but man lives not by bread alone, but also by the word of God. There is lack of clothing against the cold; but he who has put on Christ has both raiment and ornament enough. The half-shaven head looks frightful; but since the head of the man is Christ, the head which is thus distinguished for the Lord's name must be honorable in any form." It might seem hard, that "no opportunity was had there for the priests of God to offer and celebrate Divine sacrifices." They must however consider their sufferings themselves a sacrifice to God of the most precious and acceptable kind, that was sure also to be followed with the largest return of heavenly profit. The priests had gloriously led the way in this service, presenting themselves as victims holy and without spot on the altar of God; and the fruit of their consecration was now seen in the similar devotion also of their flocks. "Following your example, a large portion of the people have made with you a like confession and won a like crown, joined with you in the strongest bond of love, and not to be separated from their pastors either by prisons or mines. Among these are not wanting virgins, to whose sixty-fold fruit is now added the hundred-fold, and who are borne thus with double glory towards the celestial crown. Boys also have earned the praise of confession by a virtue beyond their years." In conclusion, they are exhorted to wait joyfully for the hour of their triumphant departure; while an interest is begged in their prayers in the mean time, as now likely to be of special force and effect, in behalf of Cyprian himself and others, whose testimo-

ny had not yet come so nearly to the like glorious end; "that God may deign to consummate the confession of us all, that he may set us safely and gloriously free, along with you, from the darkness and snares of the world, so that we who have stood joined together in the bonds of charity and peace, both against the assaults of heretics and the pressure of the heathen, may rejoice together likewise in the regions of bliss."

In answer to this we have three different letters, written from different locations in the mines, in which these sufferers acknowledge in the warmest terms the kindness of Cyprian, reciprocate his expressions of love, and modestly return his praises as properly less theirs than his own. "*Es enim omnibus in tractatu major,*" they say, "*in sermone facundior, in consilio sapientior, in patientia simplicior, in operibus largior, in abstinentia sanctior, in obsequio humilior, et in actu bono innocentior.*" They were only his disciples. His confession before the proconsul, followed by his banishment, had been like the sound of a trumpet, summoning the soldiers of God to battle. This first shock, so well sustained, must carry with it the merit in some sense of all that had followed. They hoped only to share with him the crown of his confession by following its steps. They were now helped by his animating words; let him go on still to help them with his continual prayers.

Under a new provincial governor, Cyprian was recalled after nearly a year's absence, and directed to keep himself in the mean time to a retired country residence in the neighborhood of Carthage, till his fate should be farther settled by a new rescript which was now expected from Rome. Valerian had determined to proceed to more rigorous measures for the suppression of Christianity. For bishops, priests and deacons, the penalty was now to be at once death; senators and knights were to have their property confiscated first, and then if they still persisted in their Christian confession must likewise lose their lives; in certain other classes of persons again confiscation was to be joined with banishment and chains. The policy was to remove the clergy, and arrest the spread of Christianity among the higher classes. Pope Sixtus, who had lately dared to take the post of honor made vacant by the death of Stephen, and with him four deacons of the Roman church, were the first victims of this new bloody proclamation. They suffered martyrdom on the sixth of August 258. In Carthage, as Cyprian writes in a letter to Successus (Ep. 80), all the clergy stood to their place, 'ready for the brunt of battle, and fully made up in mind for immortality and glory.' By private messengers, he had learned the true

nature of the late edict. Despatches were on the way now from the Emperor to the proconsul; "the coming of which we hope for every day," he adds, "with firm faith looking towards the hour of our passion, and expecting through the help and mercy of the Lord the crown of everlasting life." Then follows a request that this information might be conveyed to the bishops of the province generally; "in order that by their exhortation the brotherhood may be everywhere strengthened and prepared for the spiritual conflict, so that all may think less of death than of immortality, and being consecrated to the Lord with full faith and entire heart may rejoice rather than fear in this confession, in which as they know the soldiers of God and of Christ are not killed but crowned."

The rescript came. Soon after it was understood that lictors were sent to bring Cyprian to Ulica, where the proconsul had gone at the time to hold his court. With the advice of his friends, however, he withdrew, and kept himself concealed, till the procurator came back to Carthage; in order that he might have the privilege of laying down his life among his own people. So he himself explains the matter in the last letter we have from him, (Ep. 81), addressed at this time to the presbyters, deacons, and universal people of his charge. "It is meet and proper," he writes, "that a bishop should confess the Lord in the place where he has presided over the Lord's church, and the whole flock be made illustrious by the testimony of the pastor in their midst. For whatever the confessing bishop speaks in the moment of confession, he speaks by God's inspiration with the mouth of all. But the honor of our glorious church must suffer damage, if I the regular bishop of another charge should, after sentence, received on confession at Ulica, go as a martyr from thence to the Lord; whereas it is my continual prayer and most earnest wish, both for my own sake and for yours, to confess among you, to suffer there, and thence to depart to the Lord. We wait accordingly in this retreat the return of the proconsul to Carthage, ready to hear from him the imperial instructions in regard to those who bear the Christian name, and to speak what it may be the Lord's will to have spoken at the time."

With the return of the proconsul, the illustrious bishop of Carthage again made his appearance, and was immediately afterwards taken into custody. The whole church in that city was thrown into commotion. A large multitude of people accompanied him to the place of judgment and kept watch through the night in dense crowd before the house in which he was kept

confined. When brought before the magistrate, he witnessed a firm, good confession; which drew after it at once his doom to a violent death. The sentence was pronounced: *Let Thascius Cyprian be executed with the sword*. "God be praised!" responded the bishop, and said no more. He was then led, in the midst of a vast body of people, to the spot where his execution was to take place. Here he disrobed himself, kneeled down, and prayed. When the executioner approached, he directed twenty five pieces of gold to be paid to him for what he chose to regard in this way as a service of love. He then bandaged his own eyes; two of his clergy bound his arms; with trembling hand the executioner raised the fatal sword; the venerable head fell. So ended the tragic, but triumphant scene. The object of the saint's ambition was reached. The glorious crown of martyrdom was at last fully and forever won.

The Christians, we are told, spread napkins and handkerchiefs on the ground, that they might be consecrated as relics, it would seem, by coming into contact with the baptism of blood.

The execution took place on the 14th of September a. 258, in the midst of a plain, thickly set with trees, a short distance out from the city. The body was buried privately, during the following night, on the Mappalian way. Two churches were afterwards raised to his memory; one under the name *Mappalia* on the spot where he was buried; the other on the place of his execution, which received the name of *Mensa Cypriana*—that is, the *table* or altar where he was offered as a sacrifice to God. His bones were transferred long after, in the time of Charlemagne, to France.

We shall not pretend to follow this general account of Cyprian's life, with any separate portrait of his character. Our sketch has been so framed, as to allow this to speak for itself. No one can doubt especially the reality and strength of his piety. Religion with him was no form merely, no empty theory or notion, but a living power which possessed and ruled the entire man. He has been charged with a disposition to make too much of the simply outward. But no mistake could be greater than to suppose, that the outward was of any worth or force for him in any merely external view. There was nothing mechanical in his religion, nothing magical or superstitious. He did make account of the outward; but it was only as he held it to be joined, by Divine supernatural association, with the real presence and invisible action of the Spirit. He had no sense for what is sometimes taken to be the highest order of spirituality in modern times—that religious experience, which affects to be

independent of all outward supports and helps, and claims the power of entering into communion directly with the Most High, by virtue simply of its own upward endeavors and flights. Where such habit of thought prevails, the relation between the outward and inward in religion is always felt to be more accidental than necessary, and it becomes accordingly a sort of principle and maxim that the one can be exalted only at the expense of the other. To be spiritual then is regarded as one and the same thing with being lifted by the activity of the mind, (assisted it is presumed by the Holy Ghost,) out of the world of sense into that of pure thought and feeling; whilst to make account of the objective, in the character of any outward institutions or forms, considered either as human or divine, is taken to be just the opposite of spirituality in its true and best sense. Those who are in this way of thinking can never understand the necessity of laying much stress on the idea of the church and the holy sacraments. They are terribly afraid of what they call reproachfully the sacramental system. The sacraments may be good enough in their place, they think, and the church too is to be honored, particularly under its *invisible* character; but there is a constant tendency in the human mind to make such outward things a substitute for evangelical piety, that is, for the action of the soul as such conversing with God directly in an inward way; and so it is necessary to be very jealous of any view which seems to ascribe to them more than a simply rational and natural force. With this whole mode of thought, it is most certain that Cyprian had no sympathy whatever. His religion was not *evangelical*, in any such technical Baptist or Puritanic sense. The idea of any opposition between the Gospel and the Church, lay as far as possible from his mind. Christianity with him was essentially churchly and sacramental. He could have had no patience with any spirituality, which might have plumed itself on being indifferent to this side of the mystery of godliness, under the dream of moving in a higher and more ethereal region. All *such* spirituality he would have denounced at once, beyond every sort of doubt, as false spiritualism only, Gnostic hallucination, the action of the simply natural mind in the way of religion substituted for the operations of grace under its proper supernatural form. To be in the Spirit was not in his view any exaltation merely of the natural mind as such; that would be after all something born only of the *flesh*, which can never by any stimulation, we are told, produce any thing higher than itself (John iii: 6); it implied

the presence and action of the Holy Ghost in the world under a real form, which was taken to be above nature, and which was felt to involve thus necessarily the idea of an actual constitution, in the bosom of which only, as distinguished from the world in its common form, it could be possible to have part in the grace it was supposed to comprehend. This constitution presented itself to his mind, as an object of faith, according to the Creed, in the mystery of the Holy Catholic Church. There accordingly, and not in the sphere of our natural life on the outside of this Divine constitution, the Spirit was regarded as dwelling and working in a most real objective way, for the sanctification and salvation of sinful men. All true spirituality then, in the view of Cyprian, was conditioned by the believing acknowledgment of this mystery, and an actual submission to the power of it in its own place and under its own proper form. He made vast account certainly of the outward church, of the regular priesthood, of the holy sacraments, of ecclesiastical institutions and forms generally; but it was just because he made all in all of the action of the Spirit, and believed at the same time that such supernatural grace was not to be found in the order of nature, but offered itself for the use of men only in the church, and so through the ministrations and forms of the church—that it was a mystery in such view, which men are bound to take as they find it by faith, and the whole sense of which is lost the moment they pretend to deal with it as an object of mere natural sense and reason.

All falls back then to the question, Was this conception of Christianity true or false? To say that Cyprian laid undue stress on outward institutions and forms, is at bottom simply to call in question the soundness of his whole theory of religion, which was at the same time, as we have seen, the universal theory of the early church—the same too that the church of all ages has professed to accept, in the repetition of the creed. Let this theory be supposed wrong—let the mystery of the Spirit, as a power working in the church under such real supernatural form, (*foolishness* to the natural mind always of course.) fall to the ground, or, which is the same thing, resolve itself into the spiritualism of Quakers, Baptists or Deists, and then it will be easy enough certainly to make out here a most serious defect in the constitution of our martyr's piety. The only difficulty will be to see, how he could have had any true and genuine piety at all. But on the other hand, simply reverse the supposition just made. Instead of taking it for granted that no supernatural grace belonged to the outward church, through the

real presence of the Holy Ghost in its organization, imagine hypothetically the precise opposite of this—that the Holy Ghost namely *was* present and active in the church as a mystery for faith, and that what Cyprian believed here was objectively real and true; and who cannot see, that the whole force of the objection now under consideration is at once overthrown.

That is all that is wanted, to set a religion of sacraments and priestly forms in perfect harmony with the demands of inward piety. Who will pretend, that such a mode of being in the Spirit—if only the mystery itself be no fiction or dream, and faith be brought to yield itself heartily to its power—is not after all something quite as evangelical and spiritual, if we look at it properly, as the highest flights of devotion under any altogether inward and exclusively subjective form? We may, if we choose, question the reality of this objective grace, the presence of any such actual shekinah in the outward Christian temple. But we are bound at least to allow to Cyprian and his age, the benefit of the imagination. We must judge the early church from the standpoint of its own faith, and not from a position which assumes that this faith was a lie. We must be willing to plant ourselves, for this purpose, on the premises of the ancient creed, taken in its proper original sense. In no other form, can our judgment possibly be entitled to the least respect. Either these premises were true, or they were false. Admit them to have been true, and you can have no right to charge the sacramental system of the ancients with superstition, or to say that they lost sight of the Spirit, the only real source of the truly spiritual as distinguished from the merely *spiritualistic*, in magnifying and exalting ecclesiastical forms; just as little as you may impute superstition or formality to Moses for acknowledging reverentially the presence of God in the burning bush, instead of turning away from it to converse with Him only in his own spirit. Will it be said then that the premises of the creed are false? Very well. That is at all events clear and fair. Then the charge in question has indeed full force. The sacramentalism of the ancients was in sober truth superstition, formalism, miserable mumminery, the dead mechanical service of the flesh substituted for the living service of the spirit. But what then becomes of their whole Christianity? How preposterous to speak of it or think of it still, as a Divine fact, as a mystery which carried, in it really and truly the power of the world's salvation. To such issue must the whole question come at last.

We have seen already to some extent, how Cyprian's doctrine

of the church gave character and form to his theological system at other points. Along with the idea of a real Divine polity, as truly present in the world as the Jewish theocracy by which it was foreshadowed, went in his mind the conception also of a ministry exercising really Divine functions, of a proper priesthood, of sacraments powerful to take away sin and forward the soul in the way of everlasting life. Baptism, confirmation, the mystical presence of the holy eucharist, the awful sacrifice of the altar, penance, including confession and absolution, the sacrament of orders, consecrations and holy rites generally, derived for him their significance and force from this article of the Holy Catholic Church. Here only the Bible could have its right authority and proper use. Here only any virtue could have true Christian merit. The idea of the church determined the view taken of heresy and schism. We have seen how it carried the sense of the communion of saints beyond the grave also, leading naturally to sacrifices and prayers for the dead, and encouraging the belief that the saints in heaven make intercession for their brethren who are still in the world. The veneration for relics, which we find in the church from the earliest times, must be referred to the same general sentiment. All these conceptions belong predominantly, we may say, to one general side of the system before us. It remains now to notice briefly the same scheme of Christianity under a second general aspect, in the view it takes of what may be considered more particularly and directly the experimental practical side of the Christian salvation. This will be found to be also conditioned and determined throughout, by the realistic apprehension of the church that enters so universally into the ancient faith. All rests on the basis, and falls into the order, of the Apostles' Creed.

We have in the first place a corresponding view of the natural state of man since the fall. Cyprian has indeed but little to say directly of original sin and its consequences. The controversy with Pelagianism belongs to a later time. But it would be a great mistake to suppose, for this reason, that he had no apprehension or sense of the truth which this controversy afterwards brought into full view. The fact of the fall, and of the consequent moral helplessness of the race, may be said to enter as a sort of quiet substratum into his whole system of religion. This in truth is the case necessarily with any theory of Christianity, in which earnest is made with the mystery of a supernatural church, as was done always in the beginning. The Creed itself, as we all know, is silent on the subject of original sin. But is it this for reason of any uncertain sound as regards Pe-

lagianism? By no means. Puritanism, in its modern form, may affect to find in it here a serious ellipsis, and a reason for tinkering it into new and more orthodox shape. But in the end the very silence of the old Creed on this point is of deeper and more solemn force, than any amount of strained articulation, brought out in the abstract angular style of this unchurchly school. Is it asked why? The answer is easily and immediately at hand. The fact of the fall must of necessity be interpreted always by the fact of redemption. Let this last resolve itself into an abstraction, a mere Gnostic philosophem, as it must always do where Christianity ceases to be churchly and sacramental, and the felt realness of the other will be lost for faith precisely to the same extent. In place of the fact, we shall have a notion, a philosophical myth, in the end a Calvinistic or Hegelian *necessity* simply in the constitution of our natural human life. The only effectual protection from such error, is to be found in the right apprehension of the mystery of the Holy Catholic Church; for this at once brings into view the order of grace as something really in the world, through Christ, under a form above nature—a supernatural mystery—in the bosom of which only the redemption of the race is to be reached; a fact which it is impossible to see and acknowledge heartily, without being made to see and feel at the same time the reality of the fall, as a moral and not simply physical calamity, and the terrible nature of the consequences in which the race has come to be involved by reason of it. No testimony against Pelagianism can be stronger than that of the Creed, regarded in this view. It goes full against all modern theories of the perfectibility of man, considered in the order of nature only. It lays the axe at the root of all humanitarian dreams, by proclaiming the necessity and actual presence of another higher order of life for the accomplishment of man's true destiny. To have any living sense of the mystery that is comprehended for faith in the Church, with its remission of sins, communion of saints, resurrection from the dead and life everlasting, is necessarily to be penetrated to the same extent with the feeling that the life of nature as it lies on the outside of this most real constitution of the Spirit, is absolutely under the power of sin and death; and it is not too much to say, that without such faith in the mystery of the Church, (the world in which the saints *live* on both sides of the grave, and whose powers miraculously transcend the whole reach of the natural understanding,) no sense of what humanity is naturally, and apart from the range of this new creation, can ever be properly sufficient and complete. Faith

in the objective realness of supernatural grace in the church, is the indispensable condition of faith in the objective realness of the fall in the sphere of nature.

Those who make the church a human corporation only, and baptism a mere sign, will be found always to wrong in some way the true significance of the state into which the world has been brought by the fall.

With Cyprian, as we have had full opportunity to see, the world on the outside of the church was altogether without light and hope. The relation between the two states, the order of grace here and the order of nature there, was that of the ark in the time of Noah to the universal desolation with which it was surrounded. The same character of most intense realism extended itself in his mind, to both sides of the awfully solemn contrast. Hence came the saving force of baptism in one direction, the damning power of schism in another. He saw in the first a real translation from the power of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son; in the last a no less real abandonment of this kingdom for the empire of Satan, the god of the present world, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience and wrath. He took in strict sense all those passages of the New Testament, in which the world in its natural state is represented as being under the dominion of Satan, as alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in it by reason of sin, and as doomed to perish and pass away in its own vanity; while the true end of man's life is to be sought and found only in a higher order of existence, brought to pass for him through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, and offered to him now as a Divine word or promise, which he is required to embrace wholly by faith. The whole poverty and misery of nature, as thus opposed to grace and the hope of everlasting life in Christ, come together for Cyprian in the conception of what he calls the "*seculum*," the course of our general human existence as related simply to the present world. This in its best estate is altogether vanity. It is blind, dark, prone to all evil, and powerless to all good. It lies under the curse of the fall. It is a state of dismal exclusion and exile from paradise. Those who belong to it walk continually in a vain show. Their life is a false and empty dream; from which they are to wake hereafter only to shame and everlasting contempt.

All salvation, in these circumstances, is held to be only and wholly of God's free grace. It can be in no part the fruit of human activity or counsel, going before this grace or working aside from it in any way of separate merit and power. The

Creed rests throughout on the idea, that redemption in the case of men is possible only in an order of things above nature, in the bosom of a supernatural system. The ancient theory of the church and sacraments, rightly apprehended, here again cuts up all Pelagianism by the roots. It takes in the most real sense the declaration, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Mere nature or flesh is held to be absolutely impotent for all purposes of righteousness and life. We must be saved by grace, descending upon us from heaven under another mode of existence altogether. For this great mystery room is made only through the death and resurrection of Christ. No other foundation can be laid. He is the propitiation for our sins. He is the second Adam. Through him only is it possible to have access to the Father. Cyprian is every where full and explicit in the acknowledgement of all this. He is of one mind in regard to it with St. Paul.

On the question moreover of the personal appropriation of this objective salvation, he would have been ready to answer promptly: "By grace are we saved *through faith*; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." The subjective side of this new creation, no less than the objective, was for him undoubtedly something that sprang, not from nature as such, but only from the new order of life itself which it was required to embrace. But it is hardly necessary to say, that the doctrine of justification by faith, as we have it brought out by Luther at a later day, is not to be found anywhere in Cyprian's writings; for it is now generally understood and admitted, that it was unknown in this form to the ancient church universally. This does not at once show the doctrine to be at war with the ancient faith. Theology may require in a later stage of its history distinctions and determinations, which were not called for in the period going before. The two conceptions of justification and sanctification, which it has been found so important to hold apart in our Protestant confessions and catechisms, flow always more or less together in the Bible; and in the thinking of the early church they come before us continually in the same concrete form. The objective side of the process is never so sundered from the actual life of the personal subject, as to be considered his property, without being at the same time a real quality of his life itself in some way. Cyprian, as we have seen, makes vast account of faith. But it is not just in the Lutheran view of this grace. Faith with him is simply the acknowledgment of the mystery of the Christian salvation as something actually present in the church, and a firm reliance on it in such view for

the accomplishment of its own ends. It is the power of owning practically, as certain and true, the supernatural realities of the Gospel, the solemn assurances of God's word, which the natural mind is able at best to embrace only as unsubstantial notions. The declaration that the just shall live by faith is taken to mean in this way, that the lively apprehension of heavenly and eternal things enables the righteous man, the true follower of Christ, to overcome the world and lay hold on everlasting life. This would seem to be the same view that is taken of the subject in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews; where the examples brought forward from the Old Testament go singly to show the power which this supernatural principle has in the just, to enable them to do what would be impossible to mere nature, by making sure to them, on the authority of some Divine word, things that have no certainty in any other form. Faith in this case is not the instrument simply, by which righteousness is received in a purely outward way; it is regarded rather as the very form of righteousness itself in the believer's soul; as where St. Paul says: "We walk by faith; or St. John: "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." In Cyprian's scheme of theology the efficient cause of justification is the mercy of God, the meritorious cause the righteousness of Christ, the instrumental cause the sacrament of baptism, while what has been called the formal cause is the actual appropriation of this objective grace on the part of the sinner himself. The power of such appropriation is something above nature, a gift from God which goes along with the grace that is offered to it in the church; the exercise of it however is necessarily an active state of the personal subject in whom it is found, and must set what it appropriates in real union with his life. It makes him just, implants in him a real principle of righteousness, by the new living relation into which he is thus brought with the redemption that is found in Christ. This justice or righteousness supposes faith throughout; involves it; holds in the power of it continually as its necessary subjective form. Faith so joined with its proper object is of itself a state of justification. In such view again however, it is at once more than mere faith. It includes also charity or love, by which it becomes at the same time the germ of sanctification, the principle of all good works.

In this way we may easily comprehend how Cyprian comes, in the full spirit of the whole patristic theology, to lay so much emphasis and stress on the necessity and merit of good works. On this subject he abounds in a style of speaking, which is apt

to strike modern evangelical ears as being, to say the least, very unguarded and by no means safe. His language sounds often like a downright contradiction of what many take to be the sense of St. Paul, on the doctrine of salvation by faith. It seems to make all hang rather on works; and taken in connection especially with the virtue he attributes to the sacraments, may readily enough be construed as lending countenance to a merely legal religion of the most outward and mechanical sort. No one however can enter into Cyprian's spirit, or make himself at home in his actual world of thought, without feeling that no such judgment can be relied upon as intelligent and just. Cyprian is no dealer in mere forms and dead works. If his piety seem to us of this cast, there is fair room to suspect something wrong in ourselves. We are bound at all events to believe, that we have not penetrated fully the sense of his system; and should consider it worth our serious pains, to cultivate some better acquaintance with it in its own proper form.

He himself, it is certain, never dreamed of being in the least opposition, here to the doctrine of St. Paul. The idea of good works, of works acceptable to God and deserving heaven, on the part of the simply natural man, never entered into his mind. They are considered possible only in the case of one who is already made just to some extent, by being united to Christ through the glorious power of the gospel. They are the fruit of supernatural grace. They own their whole possibility and worth to the "obedience of faith," and the actual mystery of righteousness which is made to meet and fill this habit of the soul in a real way through the church. Hence they can have no place on the outside of this Divine constitution. Even martyrdom, in a state of schism, has no merit. In the church however, such works are but the necessary product of the Christian life itself. Without them, faith must be dead. If it live and act at all, it must *work by love*. It completes itself in the form of good works; which then are not another different kind of righteousness, but serve simply to bring into view the full meaning and force of the inward habit from which they spring; just as the branches of the vine bring forth fruit, in virtue of the life which unites them to the parent stock. As such fruit, the real produce of the branches, detracts nothing from the proper dignity of the vine, but sets this rather in the most conspicuous light; for what would the vine be without foliage and fruit; so says our blessed Lord himself: "Herein is my Father glorified, that *ye bear much fruit*; so shall ye be my disciples." And as good works are necessary in this way, so may they easily be

seen to carry with them actual merit also ; not of course in the way of any original or independent desert on the part of the believer ; all thought of that is excluded by the relation in which they stand necessarily to the only source and fountain of all righteousness in Christ ; but yet as really and truly laying a foundation for reward, through God's mercy, in the new world of grace to which they belong. They are in this view a qualification for glory and honor and immortality, and may be said to deserve accordingly the crown they are hereafter to receive.

Very special virtue is attributed, in particular, to the giving of alms and to works of mercy in every form. Prayer, we are told (*De Oratione Dominica*, §. 32,) in order that it may be efficacious, must not be naked and alone. "Sterile supplications to God have no power. As every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire, so prayer without fruit can have no merit with God, being divorced from work. This Divine Scripture teaches, when it says (Tob. xii : 8): 'Prayer is good with fasting and alms.' For he who will render a reward in the day of judgment for works and alms, inclines now also graciously to him who joins work to prayer. Thus at last Cornelius, the Centurion, when he prayed, was found worthy to be heard. He gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway ; and so an angel stood by him as he was praying about the ninth hour, with this testimony to his work : Cornelius, thy prayers and thine alms have come up for a memorial before God. Swiftly those prayers ascend to God, which are borne to him by the merit of our good works."

The tract *De Opere et Eleemosynis*, as its title shows, is entirely devoted to this subject. We learn at once from its introduction, in what light works of mercy are regarded, and in what relation they are supposed to stand to the great interest of salvation.

"Many and great are the divine benefits," it runs, "which the abounding kindness of God the Father and of Christ has wrought and is still working for our salvation ; that the Father sent his Son to restore us and give us life, and that the Son was willing to be sent and to become the Son of Man, in order to make us the sons of God—humbled himself, that he might raise those who were before prostrate—was wounded, that he might cure our wounds—became a servant, that he might bring liberty to those who were in bondage—endured death, that he might bestow on mortals immortality. These are manifold and great gifts of Divine mercy. But what providence is it besides this, and how great clemency, that salutary counsel has been

taken prospectively for the full preservation of man when thus redeemed. For when the Lord coming into the world, had healed those wounds which Adam carried, and cured the old poison of the serpent, he laid down the law, that he who was made whole should sin no more, lest something worse should happen to him. We were shut up and confined to close bounds by the injunction of innocence. Nor would there have been any help for the lapses of human frailty, if the Divine goodness had not again interposed, by pointing to works of justice and mercy, to open for us a way of maintaining salvation—that whatever stains should afterwards be contracted, we might wash them away *by alms*. The Holy Spirit declares in the Divine Scriptures: ‘By alms and faith sins are purged’ (Prov. xvi: 6). Not of course those sins which were first contracted; for these are purged by the blood and sanctification of Christ. So again he says: ‘Water will quench a flaming fire; and alms maketh an atonement for sins’ (Sir. i.: 30). Here also it is shown and proved, that as by the laver of saving water the fire of hell is quenched, so the flame of sins is set at rest by alms and good works. And whereas remission of sins is given once in baptism, continuance in such well doing afterwards as a certain semblance of baptism again procures the Divine indulgence. This our Lord also teaches in the Gospel. For when his disciples were noticed for eating without having first washed their hands, he answered and said: ‘Did not he that made that which is without make that which is within also? But rather give alms of such things as ye have, and behold all things are clean unto you’ (Luke xi: 40–41); showing and teaching thus, that not the hands are to be washed, but the breast, and that stains within are to be removed rather than such as are without—that he who has purged that which is within may be said to have purged also that which is without, and with the cleansing of the mind to have begun to be clean also in his outward person. And then to show how we may be pure and clean, he added that we must give alms. The Merciful One teaches and exhorts to do mercy, and because he seeks to preserve those whom he has with great price redeemed shows how such as have become polluted after the grace of baptism may again be purged and made clean.”

This is sufficiently plain. Baptism takes away all previous sins; but it makes no provision for sins afterwards committed. For the removal of these, mere repentance and prayer are not enough. Fasting is not enough. There must be works of charity and mercy. These, by God’s gracious appointment,

have a real force to do away the stains thus contracted by the soul, and to recommend it anew to the Divine favor.

The tract then goes on to exhort those to whom it is addressed, to make free and continual use of this heavenly indulgence. Quotations and examples are brought forward largely from the Bible. One is almost surprised to find them so full and apt: The use made of the case of Tabitha, in the Acts of the Apostles, (ix: 36-42), is striking. Alms had power here, it is said, to restore even from the first death. When Peter came into the room where her corpse lay, he found himself surrounded by widows weeping and showing the coats and garments which she had made while she was yet with them, "interceding for the deceased not so much with their voices as with her own works." Peter felt that what was so asked could be obtained, and that Christ who had himself been clothed in his own poor would not be wanting now to their earnest supplications. "After he had kneeled accordingly, and as a fit advocate of widows and the poor presented to the Lord the prayers committed to his charge, turning to the body, which was now washed and laid out upon the table, he said, 'Tabitha, arise in the name of Jesus Christ.' Nor did he fail to bring help at once, who had said in the Gospel that whatever was asked in his name should be granted. So death is suspended, the spirit returns, and to the admiration and astonishment of all the body is restored alive once more to the light of this world. So much could the merits of mercy accomplish; of such avail were righteous works! She who had ministered to distressed widows the means of living, was found worthy to be recalled to life by the prayer of widows."

So throughout the tract, the giving of alms is enforced as something actually meritorious in the sight of God, by which men have it in their power to make satisfaction for their sins, and to lay up for themselves treasures in heaven. Such is the view of Cyprian everywhere, and such would seem to have been the doctrine of the universal church in the age to which he belonged.

Another exemplification of the same general way of thinking is presented to us, in the vast account which was made of confession and martyrdom. How far this went, we have had ample opportunity to see already. Martyrdom is regarded as a sort of sacrament. The baptism by water has its full parallel here, and in some respects more than this, in the baptism by blood. The second baptism in such form excels the first. "It is more ample in grace," according to Cyprian, "more sublime in pow-

er, more costly in honor ; a baptism, with which angels baptize ; a baptism, in which God and his Christ exult ; a baptism, after which there is no more sin ; a baptism, which consummates the growth of our faith ; a baptism, which as we leave the world unites us at once with God. In the baptism of water we obtain remission of sins ; in the baptism of blood, the crown of virtue. It is a thing to be embraced, and desired, and sought with our most importunate prayers, that we who are the servants of God may be also his friends" (*De Ech. Martyrii*, §. 4). It is emphatically a good work, the sublimest act of faith, the most intense concentration of the whole meaning and power of the Christian life ; and in the same proportion it carries in it the real merit of this life, power to please God, power to atone for sin, and a title to everlasting glory and renown in the world to come. For this way of looking at the subject, there was supposed to be full justification in those frequent passages of the Bible, in which the trials and sufferings of the pious for righteousness' sake are represented as being sure of a corresponding reward hereafter ; such as : "*Precious* in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints".—"They that sow in tears shall reap in joy."—"Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake ; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."—"Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, &c. Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy ; for, behold, your reward is great in heaven."—"Whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it."—"There is no man that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting."—"If we suffer, we shall also reign with him." These, and many other texts besides of like strain, were taken, by the simplicity of the ancient church, in the most literal and strict sense. They were felt to mean precisely what they seem to say ; and in view of them, there seemed to be no extravagance, in glorifying as was done on all sides the merit of confession, or in making it an object of ambition even, to win the laurels of martyrdom, and to wear its everlasting crown. To a generation, whose highest ideal of the perfection of man is a vision of rail roads, electric telegraphs, natural science, material prosperity, and self governing democracy, all this may appear sufficiently fanatical and not exactly according to evangelical rule. But the church in the beginning, it is hardly necessary to say, was no such generation. It had faith. Its ideal was in the world of things not seen and eternal.

Another special and extraordinary form of merit was found in the state of virginity. In the third book of his *Testimonia*, Cyprian devotes a special head (c. 32) to this subject, made up altogether of such Scriptural passages as appear to him in point for establishing its claims. They are taken partly from the Old Testament, and partly from the New: Gen. iii: 16.—Math. xix: 11, 12.—Luke xx: 34–35.—I Cor, vii: 1–7, 32–34.—Ex. xix: 15.—I Sam. xxi: 5.—Rev. xiv: 4. It is not to be questioned but that these passages, rightly considered, are of real force in favor of the principle which is here involved. They go to show, in harmony with the natural religious sense of the whole world, that virginity and continence are not a matter of indifference in the service of God, but form in certain circumstances a special qualification or meekness for coming before him in an acceptable manner. Such was the view universally of the early church, back it would seem to the very time of the Apostles. Hence the great importance attached from the beginning to the celibacy of the clergy. Hence the account made of widows and virgins, devoted to God and consecrated to the service of the church. They form a standing class in the Christian congregation, as well known as any order of the clergy. Cyprian refers to them often, and speaks of their state always in terms of the highest respect. We have one tract from him, *De Habitu Virginum*, occupied wholly with this subject; which while it brings into view some faults and disorders belonging to the system as it then prevailed in Carthage, and aims severely at their correction, may be said notwithstanding to overflow with veneration throughout for the institute itself, as one that was felt to be of special ornament and worth for the Church.

The tract opens with a representation of the necessity of Christian discipline in general, for the purposes of salvation. All depends on knowing and firmly following the heavenly rules and precepts of the Gospel. Grace sets us free from our previous sins in baptism, makes us whole, and then says: "Sin no more, lest a worse thing come upon thee." The command of innocence follows the gift of soundness, (*dat innocentiae legem postquam contulit sanitatem*); salutary discipline must complete what by Divine privilege is thus happily commenced and made possible. So in the case of every age and state. But here he has to do with a state that is special, and as such bound to a special rule of sanctification. "Our discourse is now to virgins, who in proportion as they stand higher in glory are also an object of greater concern. They are the flower of

the ecclesiastical stock, the beauty and ornament of spiritual grace, a joyous progeny, a work of praise and honor whole and incorrupt, the image of God reflecting the sanctity of our Lord, the more illustrious portion of Christ's flock. Through these is made to rejoice, and in these largely flourishes, the glorious fecundity of the church as a mother; and the more the number of virgins is made to abound, so much the more does the joy of the mother increase. To these we now speak, these we exhort, with affection rather than authority; not as claiming, in our extreme littleness and insignificance, (of which we are fully conscious,) any right of censure, but because the more concern quickens caution, the greater is our apprehension of the assaults of the Devil." And so the tract then goes on to enforce, on the part of those to whom it is addressed, a whole and entire consecration to Christ, outwardly as well as inwardly, in the spirit of their special vocation and engagement, that such high distinction in the church might not fail finally of its proper heavenly reward. Virgins must look upon themselves as more than others dead to the present world. They were to consider themselves married to the Lord. In their case especially all ornaments all attention to dress, all vain company, were to be considered wholly out of place. They must not put themselves in any way of temptation; they are bound to avoid even the appearance of evil. Were any of them possessed of wealth? This could be no reason for laying it out in mere worldly show. Let it be devoted to charitable uses. Let it be put out to interest with God. Let it go to feed Christ in the persons of the poor. Those who had renounced the world, and embraced a state so high above it, should walk and live accordingly. The way to heaven is narrow and hard in any case; but the way of virginity, like that of martyrdom, as it looks towards a higher reward than that which awaits the common Christian life, lies also through greater difficulties and calls for greater diligence and care. Those who aspire to its celestial crown, cannot go too far in divorcing themselves from every worldly interest and expectation, and may well count every sacrifice cheap that serves in any way to help them forward in so noble a pursuit. There are different degrees of honor in heaven, for different degrees of merit; as the seed which is sown in good ground is said to bring forth fruit, some an hundred fold some sixty fold, some thirty-fold. The first hundred fold reward belongs to the martyrs. The second sixty-fold measure is reserved for virgins. Let them not shrink, with such prospect, from any self-denial required by their state. Let them remain steadily true to their vows.

In the world to come, we are told, the children of the resurrection neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are equal to the angels. 'What others are to become thus hereafter,' the address continues, 'ye have begun to be already. Ye possess the glory of the resurrection even now in this world; ye pass through the world without the world's contamination; by persevering in charity and virginity ye are equal to the angels of God. Only let the virginity remain complete and inviolate, and hold on steadily as it has bravely begun, seeking not outward ornaments of jewelry and apparel, but only those of the spirit. Let it regard God and heaven, and not bring down the eyes which have been raised on high to the desires of the flesh or world, nor fix them on things of the earth.'

The command to increase and multiply, it is said in conclusion, had regard to the wants of the world when it was yet void of population; it was for the use and service of nature. After it now comes, for such as can bear it, the rule of celibacy, in the service of the world of grace. Not as a command however; but as a counsel only, submitted to free will and choice. Heaven is made up of many mansions; among which a superior place is reserved for such as accept this higher law. All who come to the laver of baptism are there purged from their old pollution by a new birth; but this bears a character of special sanctity in those, who break in full with the desires of nature and the flesh. They bear emphatically, even here in the body, the image of the heavenly Adam. Such is the high merit of virginity, when found true to the terms of its own institution. 'Let this be your affectionate industry and care, O excellent virgins, who set apart to God and to Christ are already gone before, in better and chief part, to the Lord to whom ye are consecrated. Let those advanced in years exercise authority over the younger; let the younger encourage their associates. Rouse one another with mutual exhortations, provoke one another by virtuous competition to glory. Hold out bravely, go forward with spirit, reach happily the end. Only see that ye then bear us in mind, when virginity shall have begun in you to wear its crown.'

Here we have very clearly the Catholic conception of *evangelical counsels*, as they are called, offering to such as have power to embrace them a higher form of righteousness than that which is necessary for all men as the condition simply of their salvation; and along with this, as a matter of course the conception also of a more than usual merit in the case of such eminent saints, as well as of a title to a larger measure of

heavenly glory than is to be expected by others. In this way the door is thrown open at once for the whole ascetic system which fills so much space, and plays so important a part, in the theology and religious life of the ancient church.

It is the fashion with many in modern times, to dispose of all this side of Early Christianity in a very easy and summary way. They set it down at once for a wholesale corruption, brought into the church from the heathen world. The Oriental Philosophy abounded in ascetic maxims and practices. Gnosticism made a vast parade of similar delusions and dreams. Christianity resisted these errors; prevailed over them in fact in their foreign form; and then, strangely enough, made room for the vanquished foe in her own bosom. We have had occasion before to notice, how far this monstrous theory is carried by Isaac Taylor. The old ascetic system of the church he finds to be a wretched compound simply of Buddhism and Brahminism throughout, borrowed immediately from the conquered Gnostic sects. This is outrageously gross; and it is not easy to see certainly how it can be set in harmony with any sort of real faith whatever in the divine origin and true historical continuance of Christianity, as a revelation starting from Christ, and upheld by his Spirit. It represents however, as we all know, a widely extended theological school, both in the Episcopal body and on the outside of it, which at times affects to glory notwithstanding, (precious inconsistency and contradiction!) in the purity and strength of the Primitive Church, as a legacy of praise which it fancies itself entitled in some kind of way to consider peculiarly its own. Neander of course is far more careful and just. And yet he too falls to some extent into the same view. The relation of Christianity to the world, he tells us, is a twofold one, it must first oppose its previous life as ruled by the principle of sin, and then take possession of it positively by filling the forms of nature with its own higher power. The negative side of this process, coming before the other in the beginning, had a tendency naturally to become extreme; and the false asceticism of the Pagan and Gnostic worlds falling in at the same time with this posture of things, forced its way gradually into the mind of the church, and made the error complete (K. G. 2nd ed. I. p. 473-478.)

This is the exact counterpart of the supposed corruption of early Christianity, on another side, by the Jewish element. There the church having in the first place surmounted Judaism, is represented as afterwards allowing it to come to a resurrection again in her own bosom, and here the very same process is re-

garded as having place in the case of Paganism. In both cases, the conclusion is reached by adopting in the first place a hypothesis concerning the true nature of Christianity, which requires the facts exhibited in its actual history to be accounted for in this way. Give up the hypothesis, and the solution of itself at once falls to the ground. The great question is always, whether the hypothesis is to be regarded as true or false.

So far as the principle of the ascetic system is concerned, it would carry us quite too far to pretend to go into its examination here. We can only say, that the general spirit of the New Testament, in our opinion, together with the universal voice of natural religion in all ages of the world, and the religious instinct as it is felt by every unsophisticated mind, is full against the general position of Neander; and that the form in which the subject is placed by Isaac Taylor, and the school he represents, is nothing short of a low theory of naturalism, that will be found to be radically at war in the end with the universal conception of religion in any truly supernatural form.

We are now done with Cyprian and his theology. Our object has been to describe simply, rather than to explain or defend. We have wished however to make the picture properly coherent with itself, and to set one part of it in right relation always to another. So much was due, in a case of this sort, to simple historical verity. If the representation may have proved offensive to some, we are sorry for it; but we are not able to see well how it could be helped. What is the ground of dissatisfaction? That the subject should have been brought into inquiry or review at all? Or, that it should not have been *forced* to present itself in quite another light? Are we to be silent where history is concerned, or must we bend it into a false and deceitful shape, to escape the glare of unpleasant truth—and this too to please those, who are forever wearying our ears with the stalest cant about intelligence, knowledge, free inquiry, coming to the light, and other such common places, and yet can bear no truth or fact, no inquiry or discussion whatever, that goes to disturb and unsettle in the least the profound sense they have of their own infallibility? Cyprian's system of religion, which was at the same time that of his age, we have found to be mainly Catholic, and not Protestant. All is conditioned by the old Catholic theory of the Church; all flows, from first to last, in the channel of the ancient Creed. The whole is in such view in perfect harmony with itself. There is nothing broken or fragmentary in the scheme; and no unprejudiced mind can fail to see, that it is in all material points, in its fun-

damental principles and leading elements, the same system that is presented to us in the Nicene period, and that is brought out still more fully afterwards in the Catholicism of the middle ages. It is not the Protestantism of the sixteenth century, and much less the Puritanism of the nineteenth. This then is the same result precisely that was reached in our articles on Early Christianity; only we have it here under a somewhat different view. The result may not be agreeable or pleasant. But what of that? The only question is, whether it is true. If it be so, we are bound to take it as it is, and to make of it afterwards what we can. Why should we not be willing to know the truth? Have we any interest in ignoring it, in shutting our eyes to it, in obstinately embracing instead of it a shadow or a lie. No sophistry can ever make early Christianity to be the same thing with Protestantism. Episcopalianism here too, with all its pretension and self-conceit, has just as little real historical bottom to stand upon as the cause of the Reformation under a different form. No part of the interest can ever be successfully vindicated, as being a reprimostination simply of what Christianity was in the beginning; and it is only a waste of strength, and a betrayal indeed of the whole cause, to pretend to make good its assumptions and claims in any such violently false way. Sooner or later history must revenge itself for the wrong it is thus made to bear. Any true defence of Protestantism, as all the waking part of the world is coming to see more and more, must be conducted in altogether different style. The fact now stated must be admitted, and boldly looked in the face. Early Christianity was in its constitutional elements, not Protestantism, but Catholicism. Then there are but two general ways of vindicating the Reformation. We must either make all previous Christianity, back to the time of the Apostles, a Satanic apostacy and delusion, and say that the Church took a new start in the sixteenth century, as original as that of the day of Pentecost, and a good deal more safe and sure; which is to give up historical Christianity altogether, and so if we understand it the whole conception also of a supernatural holy and apostolic church. Or else we must resort to the theory of historical development, by which the Catholic form of the church shall be regarded as the natural and legitimate course of its history onward to the time of the Reformation, and the state of things since be taken as a more advanced stage of that same previous life, struggling forward to a still higher and far more glorious consummation in time to come. To reject both of these solutions, and to quarrel only with the facts that imperi-

ously require either one or the other as the only escape from the argument in favor of the Church of Rome, may well be pronounced *obscurantism* of the first order.

We of course reject in full the unhistorical theory ; and one object we have had in view always, has been to expose its most insane and most perfectly untenable character. It is at last but a decent name for infidelity. Religion built on any such foundation as this, rests only on the sand or wind. We are shut up then of course, so far as we have any faith in Protestantism, to the theory of historical development, as the only possible way of setting it in living union with the Divine fact of early Christianity. But this theory may be carried out in various ways, as we have shown on a former occasion. The methods of Newman, Rothe, Schaff, Thiersch, are not just the same. Neander too has in some respects his own scheme. The whole later German theology, in its better form, moves in the bosom of this theory, is constructed upon it, or at least takes it for granted, though often in a vague and indefinite way. If it be asked now, what precise construction *we* propose to apply to the subject, we have only to say that we have none to offer whatever. That has been no part of our plan. If we even had a theory in our thoughts that might be perfectly satisfactory to our own mind, we would not choose to bring it forward in the present connection ; lest it might seem that the subject was identified in some way, with any such scheme of explanation.¹ What we have wished, is to present the subject in its own separate and naked form, not entangled with any theory ; that it may speak for itself ; that it may provoke thought ; that it may lead to some earnest and honest contemplation of the truth for its own

¹ The "Obscurantism," with which we have to deal in this whole case, is ever ready to lay hold of the vague charge of *theory* and *speculation*, for the purpose of setting aside the force of facts, which it has no power to answer and no will to admit. It would fain have it that all turns here on some philosophical hobby of *historical development*, in the interest of which facts are forced to do service in a strained and violent way. We have however no such hobby to offer or defend. For development as such, in any shape, we care not a fig. We would prefer greatly indeed to have the riddle of church history satisfactorily solved, without recourse to any such help. Our trouble is altogether with *facts*. The theorization is all on the other side. All starts in a particular theory of Christianity, to which both the Bible and Church History are there required to bend throughout. Then follows a scheme of exegesis violent enough. Then again a method or plan of history, the most unnatural that can well be conceived, and as purely ideal as any construction of Hegel or Strauss. And this is to avoid speculation and "philosophy falsely so called!"

sake. The importance of the subject, the nature of the facts in question, is not changed by any theory that may be brought forward for their right adjustment with the cause of Protestantism. This or that solution may be found unsatisfactory; but still the facts remain just what they were before. There they are, challenging our most solemn regard; and it is much if we can only be brought to see that they *are* there, and to look them steadily in the face. We have had no theory to assert or uphold. We offer no speculation. Our concern has been simply to give a true picture of facts. The difficulty of the whole subject is of course clearly before our mind. We feel it deeply, and not without anxiety and alarm. But we are not bound to solve it, and have no more interest in doing so than others. We have not made the difficulty in any way. We are not responsible for it, and we have no mind or care at present to charge ourselves with the burden of its explanation. There it stands before the whole world. It is of age too, we may say, full formed and full grown; let it speak then for itself.

J. W. N.

NEANDER AS A CHURCH HISTORIAN.¹

DR. AUGUSTUS NEANDER forms an epoch in the development of Protestant Church Historiography, as much as Flacius in the 16th century, Arnold at the close of the 17th, Mosheim and somewhat later Semler in the 18th; and was by general consent distinguished accordingly, even before his death (1850), with the honorary title, "Father of Modern Church History." We have from him, in the first place, a large work, unfortunately not finished, on the General History of the Christian Church, which extends from the death of the Apostles almost to the time of the Reformation;² in the next place, a special work on the Apostolical Period,³ and one also on the Life of Christ (1837, 5th ed. 1849), which together serve as a foundation for the main work; then several valuable historical monographies, on Julian the Apostate (1812), St. Bernard of Clairvaux (1813, 2nd ed. 1849), the Gnostic Systems (1818), St. John Chrysostom (1821, 3rd ed. 1848), the Anti-Gnostic Tertullian (1825, 3rd ed. 1849); and finally some collections of smaller publications, historical for the most part in their contents, in which he describes single persons or revelations of the Christian life, from original sources indeed, but yet in more popular form for the practical religious use of a larger public—above all his "Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Geschichte des christlichen Lebens" (3 volumes, 1822, 3rd ed. 1845), a series of edifying life pictures from the first eight centuries of the Church.

Neander was fitted, as few have been, for the great vocation of a historian of the Church of Jesus Christ. By birth and early training an Israelite, and in truth a genuine Nathanael spirit, full of childlike simplicity and Messianic longings, in youth an enthusiastic disciple of the Grecian philosophy, particularly of Plato, who became for him, as he had been for Origen and other church fathers, a scientific schoolmaster to Christ⁴—he had, when

¹ Comp. my "*Recollections of Neander*" in the January number of the *Mercersburg Review* for 1851, and "*Neander's Jugendjahre*" in the *Kirchenfreund* for 1851, p. 283 ff.

² In 6 volumes, or 11 parts, from 1825 to 1852, the last of which comprising the period preparatory to the Reformation was published after his death, from manuscripts left in very fragmentary form, by Candidate Schneider. The first four volumes have appeared since 1842 in a second improved edition.

³ *Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der christlichen Kirche durch die Apostel*, in two volumes 1832, 4th ed. 1847.

⁴ In the academical gymnasium at Hamburg already, Plato and Plutarch

he received holy baptism in the seventeenth year of his age, made the course inwardly, we may say, of the world's historical preparation for Christianity, the religious process of Judaism and Paganism in their direct current towards the Gospel, and had thus broken his path already to the only right standpoint of church history, where Jesus Christ is viewed as the end towards which humanity strives, the centre of all history and the key that alone can unlock its mysterious sense. Richly endowed in mind and soul, free from all domestic cares, an eunuch from his mother's womb and this too for the kingdom of heaven's sake (Matth. xix: 12), without sense for the external distractions and vanities of life, a stranger in the material world, which in his last years was withdrawn even from his outward eye—all qualified and disposed him to bury himself, during a long and unbroken academical career from 1811 to 1850, in the still contemplation of the spirit world, to explore the past, and to make himself at home among the mighty dead, whose thinking and working belonged to eternity. As regards theology, he was primarily a disciple of the gifted Schleiermacher, under whose electrifying influence he fell during his university studies at Halle, and by whose side he afterwards stood for many years as colleague in Berlin. He always thankfully acknowledged the great merits of this German Plato, who in a period of general apostacy from faith rescued so many young men from the iron embrace of Rationalism, and conducted them at least to the threshold of the most holy place;* but he was led himself to take notwithstanding a more positive course, and set himself free accordingly from the pantheistic and deterministic elements which adhered to the

were his favorite study. The intimate friend of his youth, *William Neumann*, whose surname he afterwards assumed in Greek form at his baptism, with expressive reference at the same time to his inward change, wrote of *David Mendel*, as Neander was originally called, a. 1806 (in Chamisso's Works VI, p. 241, f.): "Plato is his idol, and his constant watch-word; he pores over him day and night, and there are few probably who take him in so entirely or with such full reverence. It is wonderful, how he has become all this so wholly without foreign influence, by mere self-reflection and honest true study. Without knowing much of the Romantic Philosophy, he has constructed it for himself, and found the germs for doing so in Plato. On the world around him he has learned to look with sovereign contempt." See, for a fuller view of Neander's education, the "Kirchenfreund," as before, a. 1851, p. 286, ff.

* Comp. especially Neander's article on *The past half century in its relation to the present time*, in the "Deutsch. Zeitschrift" established by Dr. Müller, Dr. Nitzsch and himself, 1st Vol. 1850, p. 7 ff., where he gives his view at large in relation to Schleiermacher.

system of his master from the study of Spinoza. This was for him of the greatest consequence ; for it is only on the ground of the recognition of a personal God, and of free personal men, that history can ever come to its right sense or worth. In his own particular department he was at any rate apart from this entirely independent ; since Schleiermacher's strength lay in criticism, dogmatics and ethics, and not in church history, although by his spiritual intuitions he exerted on this also no doubt a quickening influence.

From the beginning of his public activity thus, Neander appeared as one of the leading founders of the new evangelical theology of Germany, and its most conspicuous representative on the field of ecclesiastical and dogmatic history. His first and greatest merit now consists in this, that in opposition to the coldly intellectual and negatively critical method of Rationalism, he brought the *religious* and *practical* element of history again to its rights, without doing the least wrong at the same time to the claims of science. This comes into view very clearly in the preface already to the first volume of his great work, where he declares it to be the main object of his life to set forth the history of Christ, "as a speaking proof of the divine power of Christianity, as a school of christian experience, a voice of edification, instruction and warning, sounding through all centuries, for all who are willing to hear." True, he comes behind no one in learning ; with the church fathers in particular he was by years of intercourse most intimately familiar ; and although with his hearty dislike for all vanity and affectation, he never makes any parade with citations, his pertinent and conscientious manner of quoting still serves to show everywhere a most perfect mastery of the sources : for it is not by the number of citations, which at any rate may be had from second or third hand cheaply enough, but in their independence, reliability, and critical selection, that we may recognize the genuine scholar. With the most thorough knowledge of his material is joined also in him almost every other quality necessary for a scientific historian, a spirit of critical inquiry always profound, a happy power of combination, and no small talent for the genetic development of religious characters and their theological systems. But the theoretic matter is with him everywhere pervaded by a pious, at once earnest and yet gentle and deeply humble spirit. As Spener and Franke formerly, so Neander likewise views theology, and consequently church history also, not as an exercise simply of the understanding, but as a practical business of the heart at the same time, and has for his chosen motto : *Pectus est quod*

*theologum facit.*⁶ On this account, his works have a great advantage over the productions of the modern Tübingen school, as well as over the 'Text Book of Gieseler, which in point of learning and acute investigation at least deserves to be considered of equal distinction; in the case of which moreover we are bound to consider, that the author pursues a different object, and by his invaluable extracts from the original sources compensates in part for what of life may be wanting in the dry skeleton of his text. Neander moves through the history of the church with believing sense and devotional spirit; Gieseler with critical keenness of vision and cold intellect. The first lives in his heroes, thinks, feels, acts, and suffers with them; the second surveys their movements from abroad, without love or hatred, without sympathy or antipathy. The one kisses reverently the footsteps of his Lord and Saviour, wherever he may meet him; the other remains passionless and indifferent before even the most glorious revelations of the Christian life.¹

This Christian religious spirit now, which rules Neander's historical writings, and his whole habit of thought, is still farther distinguished for its comprehensive *liberality* and evangelical *catholicity*. He differs from the subjective and unchurchly pietism of an Arnold and Milner, who likewise exalted the practical element, but were able to find it for the most part only among heretics and dissenters, not only by incomparably deeper learning and science, but in this also, that though himself disposed too more than he should have been to patronize certain heretics he still finds, with right feeling nevertheless, the main stream of the Christian life, in the uninterrupted succession of the Christian Church. From the orthodox Protestant, stiffly polemical style of history, on the other hand, which prevailed in the 17th century, he differs no less in this, that although constitutionally inclined rather to the German Lutheran type in its

⁶ Those Hegelians who made themselves merry over this motto, and gave Neander in derision the title of a "*pectoral theologian*," only exposed in doing so their own shame. We cannot make theology too earnest or practical; for it has to do with nothing less than the everlasting welfare or woe of never dying souls.

¹ True, Gieseler also requires of the church historian "Christian religious spirit," on the right ground, that "we can never have a just historical apprehension of a foreign spiritual manifestation in any case, without reproducing it in ourselves" (Einl. § 5); but there is little trace of this certainly in his text, as from his rationalistic standpoint was naturally to be expected.

moderate Melancthonian form,² he rises notwithstanding above the limits of Confessionalism, and attaches himself to the standpoint of the *Union*, where Lutheran and Reformed Protestantism are apprehended as mutually supplemental parts of a higher whole. But his sympathies go away far beyond the Reformation, and take in also the peculiar forms of *Catholic* piety. For to him in truth the universal history of the Church is no accidental aggregate merely of outward facts, but a closely connected process of development or evolution, and an unbroken succession of the life of Christ through all centuries. He has won in particular the priceless merit, of having introduced a more correct judgment of the whole church *before* the Reformation; and above all of having brought home to the Protestant consciousness the theology of the church fathers over against the oldest forms of heresy, not in the service of this or that party, but in the interest purely of truth, without prejudice and in the way of living reproduction. This he did first in his monographies. In Tertullian, he drew a sketch of the African church of the second and third centuries, and taught the world rightly to appreciate this much misunderstood, rough but still natively vigorous Christian character, the patriarch of the Latin theology. In John Chrysostom, he portrayed the greatest orator, interpreter, and saint of the ancient Greek church. In Bernard of Clairvaux, he characterised with warm, though by no means blind admiration, the worthiest representative of monkery, of the crusades, and of the practical church mysticism, out of the bloom period of the previously so little known and so much decried Catholic middle ages. So did he feel himself at home in all periods, because he was met in all, though under different forms, by the same Christ. By such life sketches drawn from the original sources, and then by the connected representation of his larger work, he contributed mightily to force open the barriers of Protestant prejudice and bigotry, and to make room in some measure for a right understanding between Catholicism and Protestantism on historical ground. He appropriated to himself the deeply significant word of the Jansenist Pascal, one of his favorite writers: "*En Jesus-Christ toutes les contradictions sont accordées*," and saw accordingly in these great

² Among all the characters of church history there is hardly one, with whom *Neander* had more resemblance, both of light and shadow, than with *Melancthon*. Both are of the John-like nature, of the mild, amiable, peace-loving, conciliatory, yielding temperament, and both may be considered in an eminent sense *Praeceptores Germaniae*.

antagonisms of church history also no irreconcilable contradiction, but two equally necessary, reciprocally complementary manifestations of the same Christianity—the reconciliation of which in some future time he looked forward to with joyous hope, as something that seemed to him already typically foreshadowed in the disciple of completion and love.*

This wide hearted view of history, however, and unprejudiced acknowledgment of the great church facts of antiquity and the middle ages, which may lead possibly at last to still more weighty practical consequences than any which he himself could foresee or approve, has its ground with Neander, not by any means in a Romanizing tendency, which lay quite off from him and never entered his mind, but in his mild John-like Melancthonian temperament partly, and partly in his genuinely Protestant toleration and right valuation of the idea of personality and individuality—or in such a *subjectivity*, as raised a barrier against ultra-Protestant bigotry, no less than against Romanism or the absorption of the particular by the authority of the general. In this he is a true disciple of Schleiermacher, who in spite of the Spinozistic background of his philosophy possessed an extraordinarily keen eye for the personal and individual, and maintained everywhere its rights. What he asserted thus in the sphere of speculation and doctrine mainly, Neander carried out in history. He was pervaded with the conviction, that the free spirit of the Gospel could never exhaust itself in any fixed given form, but required for the complete representation of its infinite fulness a great variety of forms and tendencies. Hence he so often makes the observation, that Christianity, the leaven which is destined to pervade the whole of humanity, does not destroy natural capacities, national and individual distinctions, but only refines and sanctifies them; hence he shows himself such a friend to variety and freedom of development, and such a foe to all constraint and uniformity; hence his taste for monographies, and the impulse he gave to the wider cultivation of this most important method of handling church history, which by the mirror of some single representative personality holds up an entire period in concrete exhibition; hence the love and patience and conscientious truth, indifferent to nothing however small, with

* Comp. the closing words of his history of the Apostolical church, and the Dedication of the second edition of the first volume of his larger work to Schelling, where he alludes with approbation to his idea of three stages of development answering to the three Apostles Peter, Paul, and John,

which he follows the men and systems he unfolds, to whatever nation, time or tendency they may belong, in all their relations, circumstances and positions, in order then to collect the scattered particulars again into one organic general image, and to refer them to the idea that remains through all changes in unity always with itself. From the sacred reverence he had in this way for the image of God in the personality of man is to be explained finally the respect and popularity, which this no less pious than learned church father of the nineteenth century enjoys, in higher degree than any other theologian of modern times, among almost all parties of Protestantism, not only in Germany, but also in France, Holland, England, Scotland, and America, nay, so far as difference of ecclesiastical standpoint at all allows it, among liberal minded scholars even of the Roman Catholic church itself. He stands before us in this view as a true man of *mediation*, in the fairest sense of the word, in the midst of the different tendencies of the distracted Christianity of the present time, and has still as such a great and noble mission for a long time yet to fulfil by his writings.

Summing up what has now been said, the innermost peculiarity, the fairest ornament and most abiding worth, of Neander's treatment of church history, may be said to consist in the *organic interpenetration and living marriage of the two elements of science and practical religion*. The interest of edification is not attached outwardly to the subject in the form of pious reflection and declamation, but grows forth from it in a natural way; it is the spirit, which animates and fills the history of Christianity as such. Neander is religious, not *although*, but *because* he is scientific, and he is scientific *because* he is religious. That is the only sort of edification we may expect from a learned work, but which also we *must* expect, where it has Christianity and its historical development for its contents. Such benefit therefore ought never to be lost. A church historian without faith and piety is only able at best to set before us, instead of the living body of Christ, a cold marble statue without seeing eye or feeling heart.

But the task of church history calls for still more than this, in order that it may be completely fulfilled. While we respect and admire in Neander the organic union of the scientific with the *religious* element, we miss in him on the other hand the reconciliation of the scientific with the *churchly* element. We mean by this first a want of decided *orthodoxy*. In his treatment of the Life of Jesus and of the Apostolical Period, we meet views on the Holy Scriptures, their inspiration and

authority, as well as doubts on the strictly historical character of certain sections of the evangelical history, and on the genuineness of single books of the ecclesiastical canon, (namely, the First Epistle to Timothy, the Second Epistle of Peter, and the Apocalypæ,) which though by no means rationalistic indeed, are nevertheless somewhat too loose and indefinite, and make too many and at times too serious concessions, in our judgment, to modern criticism. His Life of Jesus particularly is in this respect, among all his works, the one that least satisfies the demands of sound faith, however much we must respect also the honesty and tender conscientiousness that lie commonly at the ground of his critical hesitations and doubts. There is on this difficult field at all events a scepticism, which in a moral view is more deserving of respect than that rapid and positive dogmatism, which either denies or carelessly cuts the Gordian knot, instead of bestowing serious and laborious pains on its solution. Full and unconditional reverence for the holy word of God, however, which we miss more or less in the whole Schleiermacherian school, requires in such cases, where science is not yet able to clear up what is dark, an humble bringing of reason into captivity to the obedience of faith, or a present suspension of decisive judgment, in the hope that farther and deeper inquiry may lead to more satisfactory results.

Then again however we must pronounce the theological and historical standpoint of Neander so far unchurchly also, as he does not sufficiently recognize the *objective* and *realistic* character of Christianity and the Church, and betrays through all he has written on the subject, a disposition to resolve the whole mystery into something purely inward and ideal. In this respect he appears to us quite too little Catholic, in the real and historical sense of the word. True, he is neither a Gnostic, nor a Baptist, nor a Quaker, although he often throws out expressions, which torn from their connection sound very favorably for these hyper-spiritualistic sects. He by no means mistakes the objective forces of history, and knows well how to estimate the realistic element in men, such as Tertullian, Athanasius, Augustine, Bernard, and even in the Popes and Schoolmen, up to a certain point. He has much to say indeed of general spiritual tendencies which reveal themselves in individuals, and the opposite terms of idealism and realism, rationalism and supernaturalism, logical intelligence and mystical contemplation, and the various combinations of these tendencies, belong to the standing categories of his treatment of history. But then, in the first place, he carries these differences himself for the most part back again

to a merely psychological basis, to the different constitutions of human nature, that is, to a purely subjective ground; and the prevailing point of view with him is, that the kingdom of God forms itself from individuals, or in some sense from below upwards, so that, as Schleiermacher has once said, "the doctrinal system of the church is formed out of the opinions of individuals." In the next place we see plainly, that he himself is of spiritualistic and idealistic constitution, and does not always happily avoid the dangers, to which this in its own part needful and legitimate tendency is exposed. Hence his partiality for the Alexandrian Fathers, Clemens and Origen: Hence his too favorable representation, as it seems to us, of Gnosticism, particularly of Marcion, whom he even raises, on account of his pseudo-Pauline hostility to Catholic tradition, into a forerunner of the Reformation—which, if it were true, would do this very poor service: Hence his overstrained love of equity towards all heretical and schismatical movements, in which he sees almost always from the start the presence of some deep moral and religious interest, even where they rest clearly on the most wilful insurrection against lawful authority,—a love of equity, which, though not by any means in so high a degree as with the sect-patron Arnold, runs into a want of equity towards the historical church: Hence his undisguised dislike for all that he terms the *re-introduction of the legal Jewish standpoint*, with its special priesthood and outward service, into the Catholic Church; in which he sees a contradiction to the free standpoint of St. Paul, and to the idea of the universal priesthood, (which however even under the Old Testament had place *along with* the special priesthood, comp. 1 Pet. ii: 9 with Ex. xix: 6); although he cannot himself avoid attributing to this legalism a pedagogic mission at least for the education of the Teutonic nations: Hence his indifference towards fixed church organization, and his aversion to all confessional constraint in the Protestant church, which strikes him as "bondage to the letter," "mechanism of forms," and "symbololatry." True, as regards this last point, we must allow him right in the main over against those, who would repristinate *vi et armis* some particular confession of the past, the exclusive Lutheranism for instance of the Form of Concord, without any regard to the enlarged necessities of the present time; and still more ground was there for his zeal against the philosophical tyranny of the Hegelian intellectualists and pantheists, who in the zenith of their prosperity aimed at supplanting the warm-full life of Christianity, by their dry

scholasticism and unfruitful traffic in dialectic forms.¹ But still the theological school of which we here speak is plainly wanting in a proper appreciation of the significance of law and authority in general,—a defect, that hangs in close connection with the false view we find taken of the Old Testament in Schleiermacher's theology and philosophy of religion, as well as with his onesided half-Gnostic ultra-Paulinism. The freedom for which Neander so zealously contends is seemingly of the latitudinarian sort, loses itself at times in the indefinite and wilful, and would cover for example Sabellian, Semi-arian, Anabaptist, Quakerish, and other dangerous errors, with the mantle of charity. Much as we may respect the noble mind that lies at the bottom of this, we must never forget still the weighty maxim, that true freedom can thrive only in the sphere of authority, the single only in the form of suitable subordination to the general, and that genuine catholicity is just as exclusive towards error, as it is wide-hearted towards the different refractions of truth.

Christianity and Churchliness are viewed by Neander more or less as contraries, while both those conceptions, according to the mind at least of the Ancient Church both of the East and of the West, are at bottom the same, and one the measure always of the other. Even the title of his large work: "*General History of the Christian Religion and Church*," seems to involve the idea, which at all events may very easily take its rise from the Protestant view of the world, that there is a Christian religion *out of* and *beside* the Church. We venture on this no positive decision, but believe that such a separation can hardly be reconciled with Paul's doctrine of the church, as the "*body of Jesus Christ*," as the "*fulness of him that filleth all in all*." The future must show, whether Christianity can be upheld without the Divinely founded institution of the Church;² that is, whether the soul can exist without the

¹ In this war with the Hegelian philosophy and its panlogism, he gave way frequently, in occasional utterances of his prefaces and still more in private conversations, to a sort of impatience and heat, which seemed to be in contradiction to his otherwise so placid and mild spirit. But hatred in this case was only reversed love. Let us bear in mind the polemical zeal of St. John against the Gnostics of his day.

² In which case, for example, the Bible and Tract Societies, (or according to Dr. Rothe the State,) would assume the functions of the Ministry, and instead of being in the church as auxiliary associations would usurp its place, and set it aside as no longer necessary. We are of the opinion

body, or must at last resolve itself into a ghost or Gnostic phantom, as certainly as the body without the soul sinks into a dead corpse. In the meantime we hold fast to the maxim: Where Christ is, there also is the Church, his body, and where the Church is, there Christ, her Head, is also, and all grace; and what God hath joined together, let not man put assunder.

With these main faults of Neander's Church History, which we have grouped together under the conception of unchurchliness in the broad sense of the term,—though on the other hand to be sure with the merits also before mentioned,—stand more or less closely connected several other subordinate defects. Neander is, so to speak, the historian pre-eminently of the *invisible* church, and has thus exhibited the development of the Christian doctrine and Christian life, especially so far as these express themselves in single theologians and pious men, in the most thorough and original way, herein surpassing in general all his predecessors. On the other hand, in all that pertains more to the external manifestation of the church, to its bodily form, he takes, by reason of the inward, contemplative, idealistic turn of his mind, less interest. This shows itself immediately in the sections on the *polity* of the church, which is treated by him even in the first ages in a very unsatisfactory manner, under the influence of his antipathy to the hierarchical element, (which however began undeniably to unfold itself in the second century already, as is shown by the Epistles of Ignatius, charged by him with interpolation even in their shorter form without sufficient ground). For the worldly and political side of ecclesiastical history, which comes into view particularly in the sphere of church polity, the relations of the Church with the State, the web of human passions, which unfortunately mix themselves at all times even with the most sacred affairs, the good man besides, with his guileless childlike simplicity of spirit and his recluse student life, had indeed no particularly sharp eye.¹ Whilst however he notices but little small and

however, that in the same proportion in which Tract Societies and other such voluntary associations, might pretend to go beyond their original sphere, and put themselves into the place of God's church, they would lose also the confidence of the sound Christian public and the blessing of heaven.

¹ Dr. Hagenbach, in his fine article on Neander in the "*Studien und Kritiken*" 1852, p. 588, takes notice also of this honorable defect of his character, and adds the remark: "The other extreme to him is found we may say in Gfrörer, who takes a pleasure in tracing the workings of intrigue and

low motives, he enters so much the more carefully into the deeper and more noble springs of actions and events, and substitutes thus for the outward pragmatism of his instructor Planck, who often derives the most important controversies from the most accidental circumstances and the most corrupt purposes, a far more spiritual pragmatism by which the interest of religion becomes the main factor of church history. If he causes us also almost to forget at times that the kingdom of God is *in* this world, it is only to make so much the more conspicuous instead of this the weightier truth of that declaration of Christ, which he has very characteristically prefixed to each volume of his larger work: "My kingdom is not *of* this world."

In the same way the excellent Neander lacked also a cultivated sense for the *aesthetic* and *artistic* side of church history—a defect, which again however appears likewise as the shadow of a virtue, grounded in the unworldly character of his mind. Had he lived in the first centuries, like Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian and others, he might have seen in art, which was then so shamefully abused in the service of heathen idolatry, a vain show at war with the humble condition of the church, if not an actual "pomp of the devil." So far indeed now he does not go; he stands in no Puritanic opposition of principle to art, for just the all pervading leaven-like nature of the Gospel is one of his favorite thoughts; he defends even the use of painting "for the glorification of religion, agreeably to the spirit of Christianity, which ought to reject nothing purely human, but should appropriate, penetrate, and refine all rather, for its own use,"¹ and approves in his account of the image controversies the middle view, which keeps equally clear of iconolatry and iconomachy as being both alike extremes. But a thorough examination of the influence which Christianity exercised just on this department of human life, a history of church sculpture, painting, architecture, music, and poetry, as well as of all that belongs to the show and symbolism of the medieval Catholic worship, is not to be looked for in his works. In this respect he is far surpassed by the spirited, though at the same time much less spiritual, *Hase*, who has first woven the history of Christian art, with fine taste, into the general body of

chicanery, but leaves out of sight in doing so the religious agency: see for example, the notice of the Gottesehalk controversy in his history of the Carlovngians."

¹ K. G. III. p. 400.

church history, in short but characteristic and pointed sketches. This indifference of Neander however to the beautiful as such, is fairly balanced to a great extent by the advantage on the other hand, that he does not allow himself to be repelled, like polite wits and worldlings, by the homely and poor estate, in which the Divine is often veiled upon earth, but knows how to appreciate the heavenly treasure in earthen vessels, the rich kernel beneath even a rough shell, or as he himself says in relation to Tertullian, "discerns the stamp of divinity in real life and brings it into view from what serves to obscure it in the present world."¹

From the same point of view lastly are we to judge also of Neander's style; which moves, heavily forward, as is well known, with tedious uniformity and wearisome verbosity, without any picturesque alternation of light and shadow, without rhetorical elegance or polish, without comprehensive classification, like a noiseless stream over an unbroken plain, and so far can by no means be recommended as a pattern of historical delineation; but which on the other side again, by its inartificial naturalness, its contemplative *Gemüthlichkeit*, its quiet presentation of the subject in hand, interests sound feeling and forms a true mirror of the finest features of the great man's character, his *simplicity* and *humility*. What is right here appears to us to lie somewhere in the middle, between the unadorned and uncolored plainness of a Neander and the dazzling brilliancy of a Macaulay.

In spite of all the faults now mentioned, Neander still remains, when we take all together, the greatest church historian which the nineteenth century thus far has produced; great too especially in this, that he never allowed himself, with all his reputation, to lose the sense of that sinfulness and infirmity which cleaves to every work of man in this world,² and with

¹ Preface to the second edition of his "Antignosticus or Spirit of Tertullian," p. xi. Comp. also the striking remarks of Hagenbach, l. c. p. 589, f., who for the completion of historical science rightly demands, that it "should take up in a living way the most different impressions of all times into the mirror of the fancy, copy the past with artistic freedom, create it as it were anew, and breathe into long since departed states the power of a fresh life, without suffering itself still to be blinded by their charm. This is the bond of poetry with history, towards which the modern age strives."

² Comp. the touching close of his Words of Dedication to his friend Dr. Julius Müller, in the second edition of Tertullian, written one year before his death: "although with you I well know, that no man is worthy of celebrity and honor, that in all we know or do we are and remain beggars and sinners."

all his comprehensive knowledge regarded himself, with right self-appreciation, as among many others a forerunner merely of that new creative epoch of Christianity, old and yet forever young, towards which he so gladly stretched his vision, with the prophetic gaze of faith and hope, from the midst of the errors and confusions that surrounded him in the present. "We stand," says he,³ "on the confines between an old and a new world, which is about to be called into being by the eternally old and eternally new Gospel. For the fourth time a life-epoch for the human race is in preparation by means of Christianity; we can furnish accordingly *in every respect but pioneer work* for the period of the new creation, when after the regeneration of life and science the mighty acts of God will be proclaimed with new tongues of fire."

Mercersburg, Pa.

P. S.

³ Preface to his *Leben Jesu*, 1st ed. p. ix, f.
VOL. IV.—NO. VI.

CHURCH SKEPTICISM.

WE said in our previous article, that the church as a divine constitution, embodying and thus making continuous the force of the incarnation, must ever work as a supernatural principle, taking up and incorporating into itself, by virtue of its own power, the entire life of the world, which as natural cannot by any process within itself reach or even apprehend the supernatural. Under this aspect we have conceived the church to present herself as an object of faith in the Creed. She comes from above, challenging our regard as containing in herself the full revelation of the kingdom of God. The whole force of the new creation in Christ, becomes operative in her bosom only, as the proper channel of its continuation, and the living organ of its development.

This whole view, it is plain to be seen, bases itself upon the fact, that in the incarnation the possibility of this is in some way made real; for if we have here no supernatural force entering in a real and living way into the constitution of nature, answerable to this purpose, we must discard both the church and the incarnation as proper objects of faith, at least in the sense of the Creed. If the incarnation does not prove itself to be a divine fact, containing in itself the sure evidence of its perpetuity, and necessitating by its very existence and nature an organism like that of the church, to carry forward and accomplish its own design by being permeated at every point with its own force, we are absolutely compelled to consider the church a human institution merely, capable, it is true, of being an object of experience, but never an object of faith. In this latter view, of course, the church cannot as in the Creed stand over against the world, by carrying along in her own bosom a new order of life, but must be taken to be the product only of the world's life, *humanizing* but never in the proper sense *christianizing*. The law of her being, in this sense, must be simply the natural workings of that power of subsumption, by which the free self-conscious activities of the individual are made to subserve necessarily the interests and advance the development of humanity as a whole. Instead of being a new creation, filled with the powers of the world to come, and whose atmosphere is holiness, which is in itself far beyond the power of human will or reason, she must be taken to be but a confederation, having for its highest end the advancement of civilization and the culture of morality. Her cultus can thus have no divine significance

or force, into which we can enter in the full submission of faith: neither can her unity in this sense be at all organic or even necessary.

If we adopt this view, it is evident that we must completely surrender our *faith*, for this involves in its very nature the consciousness of the presence of such a new order of life, as that contained in the church, according to the idea of the creed, together with an acknowledgment of it in the way of submission to its authority; for only in this submission is there any possibility of our becoming subjects of its redemptive force.—“Believe and be baptized, and ye shall be saved,” is the divine command, based upon the divine commission going before; which gives us an absolute assurance, that the kingdom of God is actually at hand for the purpose of this salvation. The objective itself here determines the act of faith, making the very trial of faith to consist in an unreserved acknowledgment of its force. “This is the condemnation, that light has come into the world, but ye prefer darkness:” that the powers of the world to come are here set before you in an outward visible way, and that ye are self condemned if ye do not, in the obedience of faith, renounce your own self judgment, and submit to be ruled by their force and directed by their guidance. It is impossible here that experience should first determine the conditions of such faith, for only in the exercise of it is Christian experience at all made possible. Submission here is the prior act, which introduces us into this new world, which alone can answer the capacity of faith or afford material for its appropriation and its experience. Equally impossible also is it, that nature should in any sense determine that which is thus above nature; for reason cannot even apprehend this new order of existence, only as it is pervaded by its power. As well might the vegetable comprehend the animal, or the material the immaterial. Hence by destroying the proper object of faith, we destroy faith itself, and the theory which leads to this properly constitutes, as we have said, church skepticism.

To avoid a theory of this kind, which regards the church as properly no object of faith, and which therefore is so infidel in its character and so pernicious in its consequences, we have endeavored to maintain that the incarnation is a divine fact, and that the church as perpetuating its divine force, is fully commensurate with all the purposes of salvation. In doing this we have necessarily made the doctrine of Christ's person the fundamental ground, as determining the nature of the church, and fully illustrating the idea of Christianity. Such a position we

have conceived it to hold in the mind of the church in her earliest period, and to this end have examined somewhat minutely the general spirit of the epistles of Ignatius. In these we have found that the church is made to rest immediately upon the person of Christ, who "was anointed that he might breathe into her incorruptibility." Every where is the church represented as the organ in which Christ's life can alone become available, and in which his authority alone rests. Only with such a conception as this does Ignatius declare, that "where Christ is there is the catholic church;" making, without the least hesitation, the one to grow out of the other. Christ's life is in itself organic, necessitating by its presence an organism at once catholic and divine. Again, under the influence of a faith precisely of the same nature does he say: "If any one be not within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God," Christ being that bread which has come down from heaven to give life unto the world, and which now resides in the Holy Eucharist,¹ to afford in truth to the hungry soul the divine "pabulum of immortality" and the actual "antidote of death." Such a view of the Eucharist is itself necessitated by the conception, that the church contains in her constitution the mysterious power of the incarnation. Only in this mystery can a sacrament have any real foundation or force, and aside from this it is only a thing appointed without containing any thing in itself to accomplish the design of its appointment. The very reason which Ignatius assigns for the doctrine of the Eucharist as held by the church, is that it is the flesh of Christ, who died and rose again, and hence he who opposes this doctrine contradicts the divine significance of the church itself, which is a virtual denial of the death and resurrection of Christ; for only in the church is Christ's sacrifice made "once for all," that is, made continuous and effective through all time. In his epistle to the Philadelphians, c. iv, he says: "Be zealous to use one Eucharist, for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup in the unity of his blood." The design of this is to show the absolute necessity of unity in the church; but this is enforced by the fact, that there is but one flesh of Christ and therefore but one organism in which this flesh can be vivific, one Eucharist

¹ "They (Heretics) abstain from the Eucharist and prayer, because they do not agree with us, that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins." *Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν, τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν αμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθούσαν, . . .* Epist. ad Smyr. c. vii.

and altar of sacrifice, to which we can bow and receive the nourishment of eternal life. Hence, not to acknowledge that such power is actually present in the church and that the bread of God is indeed within the altar, is clearly in the mind of Ignatius a deception or rather a wandering (*πλανασθω*) from the truth, which must finally end in self-pride and separation from the communion of the church. "Let no one go astray," he says in his epistle to the Ephesians, c. v, "if any one be not within the altar, he comes short of the bread of God. For if the prayer of one and another has so much power, how much more rather that which is of the bishop and the whole church? That individual therefore, not coming to this is already arrogant and has wholly separated himself (from the church). For it is written, *God resists the proud*. Let us be zealous therefore not to resist the bishop, that we may be subordinated to God "

It is plain to be seen that with Ignatius the ground of unity in the church rests in the fact, that the church is one with Christ- "Through which (the cross) in his sufferings Christ invites you, that are members of him. Therefore the head cannot be separately born without members. God promising a unity, which is himself." The head cannot be without members, and the same unity which exists between the head and members is alone made possible in the church as the body of Christ, from the fact that God has promised and actually brought to pass a unity which is himself; that is, that in the person of Christ the Word has become Flesh, in order that man might in this great mystery find the possibility of his reconciliation and communion with God. The whole epistle to the Hebrews forcibly illustrates this idea, and it seems that Ignatius had direct reference to it, in the passage above quoted. There is however an external unity as well as an internal. "Be ye subject to the bishop and to each other, as Jesus Christ to the Father according to the flesh, and the Apostles to Christ and the Father and the Spirit, that the unity may be both external and internal."*

* "Υποτάγητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ ἀλλήλοις, ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ σάρκα, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι ἵνα ἕνωσις ἡ σαρκικὴ τε καὶ πνευματικὴ," Epist. ad Magnes. xiii. It may seem at first that this passage is a denial, on the part of Ignatius, of the essential divinity of Christ, by teaching his subordination to the father; but it is evident from the *κατὰ σάρκα* that this subordination is only in the way of his being sent. So Rothe, Anf. p. 764, monet, e verbis *κατὰ σάρκα* palam fieri, non τὸν Λόγον, sed *humanam tantum* Christi naturam ab Ignatio nostro Patri subordinari. See note upon this passage in Hefele's edition of the Apostolic Fathers. Also Clement's epistle to the Corinthians c. xi. ii: "Οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῖν εὐαγγελίσθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἐξενέμθη δὲ Χριστὸς οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ"

An internal unity without any visible manifestation is nothing but a mere abstraction. There is no possibility of the one existing without the other, any more than there can be contents without form. Wherefore if ye are members of Christ your inseparable life "it is becoming that ye concur with your bishop" for this is the evidence of your acknowledgment of this relation; for your bishop does not represent merely natural powers ("They are ministers not of food and drink, but of the Church of God," epist. ad Tral. c. ii.) but actually possesses, through virtue of his office, power and authority far above that of nature; viz. that very same power which *really* followed the apostolic commission, "Going therefore teach ye &c.," and which is made continuous by a *real* apostolic succession, in a *real* apostolic church. Hence, therefore, "be ye joined to him as the Church to Christ and Christ to the Father," for only in this outward way is that inward unity, which *must* exist, made real and effective; since not being within the altar, that is, the constitution of the church as thus representing in her outward organization the full power and unity that holds in the idea of her being, ye are deprived of the bread of God, that is Christ, the necessary ground of the whole. Clearly is the church here made to flow out from the person of Christ as a new creation, having its own peculiar and exclusive polity, and destroying the least possibility of salvation outside of its own organization.

No one can doubt for a moment, that such is the doctrine of the epistles of Ignatius. On every page it is repeated again and again, in terms the most explicit and unmistakable. "He that deceives the bishop who is visible, attempts to deceive the invisible," for only through the authority of this latter has the bishop been constituted: and in as much as he is the representative and organ of the authority of the Church, and in as much as its unity is therefore made to centre in this fact, by not obeying him ye originate divisions, which are to be shunned as the "beginning of evils." Insurbordination to the outward authority of the church, is thus a virtual denial that Christ has come in the flesh, which is the sure index of heresy and antichrist. This is, as we have said, beyond all controversy the doctrine of Ignatius, viz, that the church is the living organic embodiment of the incarnate mystery, full of supernatural force, and challenging our faith as embracing an entirely new and higher order of life, into the communion of which we can only be brought by surrendering ourselves unreservedly to its authority, in the consciousness of its actual presence, both as a fact and an organization, which constitutes faith, the gift of God. Neither is this

doctrine by any means peculiar to Ignatius alone. It does not come to us in an isolated way, as the product of an individual mind, attempting to theorize into existence a notion of its own, but it every where wears on its face the evidence of its catholicity. We cannot possibly discover in Ignatius any thing like a domineering spirit, endeavoring to saddle on the faith of the church a private opinion or a self-made Creed; but on the contrary we discover at every point appeals made to awaken only, and bring into more active exercise, that which every one must and does feel and know to be the very essential of Christianity, and the very warrant of the church's continuation. We find the doctrine also receiving even fuller proof and demonstration, in the subsequent writings of Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian.

We now turn our attention to the venerable Saint Polycarp, as remarkable for his mildness as Ignatius for his fire.

Scarcely anything is known concerning the early life of Saint Polycarp. The time and place of his birth are alike involved in obscurity.³ It is certainly without doubt however, that he was taught by the Apostles; for Irenaeus, who had the best possible means of knowing, being his disciple, asserts this fact, and also that he had conversed with many who had seen Christ. He was probably the disciple of Saint John, by whom he was made bishop of Smyrna. Tertullian asserts this latter fact, when speaking of the succession of bishops in his work *De Praescriptionibus*:⁴ so also Eusebius.⁵ Jerome farther says that he was ordained bishop of Smyrna by the Apostle John, whose disciple he was. Irenaeus in his letter to Florinus, which Eusebius has quoted in the fifth book of his *Ecclesiastical History*, chapter xx, gives us a very familiar and interesting account of

³ "In general we are told that he was born somewhere in the East; as Le Moyne thinks not far from Antioch; and perhaps in Smyrna itself, says our learned Dr. Cave. Being sold in his childhood, he was bought by a certain noble matron whose name was Calisto; and bred up by her, and at her death made heir to all her estate; which though very considerable, he soon spent in works of charity and mercy. His Christianity he received in his younger years from Bucolas, Bishop of Smyrna; by whom he was made Deacon and Catechist of that church, and afterwards Bishop of the same church by the Apostle John." See the *Apostolic Fathers*, arranged by W. Adams.

⁴ "Hoc enim modo Ecclesiae apostolicae census suos deferunt: sicut Smyrnaeorum Ecclesia Polycarpum ab Joanne conlocatum refert" (*Cursus comp. Patrologiae* T. II. p. 45) et etiam Irenaeus, lib. iii.

⁵ "... καὶ τῇ Σμυρναίων ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἰδίως τε τῷ ταύτης προηγούμενῳ Πολυκάρπῳ (Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.* lib. 3: c. 36, *Comp. Patr. Graec.* T. I. p. 204).

the person and character of his fellow disciple. In this letter, which has for its object the refutation of certain false doctrines, he thus writes: "Those dogmas, not even the heretics outside of the church have ventured once to bring forward: those dogmas, those who were presbyters before us and disciples of the Apostles themselves did not hand down to you; for I saw you, while I was yet a child in lower Asia with Polycarp, doing brilliantly in the royal hall, and zealously striving to meet with his approval. I remember the things which then happened better than those which have taken place more recently; for whatever we learn in childhood grows up with the soul and becomes one with it. Therefore it is that I am able now to bring to mind the very place, where sitting the blessed Polycarp discoursed, and also his going out and coming in, and the whole style of his life, and how he looked, and the discourses which he made to the multitude, and how he was wont to speak of his familiar intercourse with John and those who had seen the Lord, and to relate their words and whatever he had heard from them concerning Him."

The same calm activity, and meekness manifesting itself in a high regard for others, and a peculiar love for tradition, which this letter of Irenaeus indefinitely suggests as the characteristics of Polycarp, are more clearly manifested in the acts of his martyrdom as recorded in the encyclical epistle of the church of Smyrna. The whole multitude of persecutors, as recorded in this epistle, being greatly astonished by the wonderful courage of the Christians, as displayed especially in the noble heroism of Germanicus, (the epistle gives an account of the martyrdom of others as well as of Polycarp), cried out, "away with the atheists: let Polycarp be sought." But, according to the narration, when Polycarp first learned this, (the news having been without doubt immediately borne to him by some of the Christians present, all of whom held him in the highest esteem), he was not at all disturbed, but desired to continue in the city, notwithstanding his perilous situation. At length however, through the earnest solicitation of his brethren, he departed from the city to a little village not far distant, and there continued a short time, doing nothing night or day but praying for all men, and for all the churches throughout the world, according to his custom. It was here during prayer that he saw the vision of the pillow burning under his head; from which he was assured that he was to suffer martyrdom by being burned alive. This place of retreat having been discovered, he was compelled to depart into another village; where he was finally taken, through the

treachery of his own domestics. The whole scene of his capture is most touchingly beautiful, and forcibly illustrates the calm grandeur and fervent love of this worthy martyr of the early church. His persecutors came upon him fully armed, as if against a robber or thief. He greeted them kindly however, and had placed before them food and drink, (it was evening,) and giving himself up to their authority, in perfect resignation to the will of God, he only desired an hour of liberty to spend in prayer. This was readily granted him, for already had his captors been deeply affected by his old age and constancy. And now, there in their very presence, in the solemn stillness of evening, this venerable and aged Martyr knelt before his God, and poured forth his soul in supplication and prayer, until the fervency of his devotion melted the hearts even of his persecutors to repentance. For two hours he continued thus in prayer, remembering all men with whom he had ever been acquainted, and the whole Catholic Church throughout the world.

It is difficult to conceive a scene more grand or sublime. A Lear, in the desolate waste, mocking the howling storm, that in the unutterable and maddening agony of his soul, seemed leagued with his unnatural children against him, has been already a painter's theme; but there cannot well be imagined a subject more fitting, in its occasion and circumstances, an artist's pencil, than Polycarp in the consciousness of approaching martyrdom, and in the more than earthly sublimity of Christian faith, kneeling in the midst of his repenting persecutors, in prayer.

Upon the conclusion of his prayer, Polycarp was immediately conducted by his guards towards the city. While on the way, he was met by Herod the chief officer (*ὁ εἰρηναρχος*) and his father Nicetes. They took him into their chariot, and endeavored to persuade him to renounce his faith, but being unsuccessful and enraged thereat they threw him out. Notwithstanding the injury which he received from the fall, he still went on with great diligence, until when going into the list, he was encouraged by a voice from heaven saying: "Be strong, and act like a man, Polycarp." Here, all attempts to make him renounce his faith, and blaspheme Christ, having also proved in vain, he was condemned to be burned alive. We will quote that part of the narration immediately preceding his death in full, in as much as it is illustrative of the doctrine of the Trinity as held by the Church, and also of the peculiar conception which the early Christians had of the sacrificial character of a martyr's death. It is thus recorded in his *Martyrium* c. xiv:

"He was not nailed, but tied (preparatory to being burned.) And, having placed his hands behind him, and being bound as a select ram from a great flock, and prepared as an acceptable holocaust to God, turning his eyes to heaven he said: O Lord God who art Almighty the Father of thy beloved and blessed Son Jesus Christ, through whom we have received a knowledge of thee, the God of Angels and powers, and of the whole creation, and of the whole family of the just who live in thy presence; I bless thee, that thou hast made me worthy of this day and this hour, that I may take part in the numbers of thy Martyrs, in the cup of thy Christ, for a resurrection of eternal life both of soul and body in the incorruption of the Holy Ghost. among whom may I be received into thy presence, in a sacrifice fat and acceptable, as thou has prepared and before made known and dost now fulfil, O God who art without falsehood and true. For this and for all things, I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee, with the eternal and heavenly Jesus Christ thy beloved Son, with whom to Thee and the Holy Spirit be glory, both now and throughout all ages. Amen."

After offering up this prayer he was immediately burned, or rather killed with a dagger, for the fire by the operation of a miracle could not consume him. After his death, as an evidence of the love of the church for the Martyrs, and according to their general custom as it seems, the brethren gathered up his bones, (his body had already been burned to deprive them from getting it, on the false plea that they would worship it, for they desired very much, it is said, to be partakers of his holy flesh,") considering them "more precious than the richest stones, and more tried than gold," and deposited them in a fitting place, so that they might thereafter celebrate the anniversary of his martyrdom.* No connected history of what Polycarp did, during the time which intervened between his ordination as bishop of Smyrna and his martyrdom, can be given. We are told by

*The date of his martyrdom is variously computed. In the prologomena to Hefele's edition of the Apostolic Fathers, we find the following which briefly comprehends the results of different investigations: "Polycarpum anno 147 passum esse vult Pearsonius, quem sequuntur Dodwellus, Caveus, Lardnerus et Gallandius. Secundum Baraterium et Stierenium Polycarpi martyrium referri debet ad annum 161; juxta Norisium et Tillemonium ad annum 166; juxta Scaligerum, Valesium, Gieselerum et Neandrum ad annum 167; Baronius denique, Usserius, Nourrius et alii anno 169 Polycarpum martyrio coronatum fuisse statuerunt. Petitum si audias, Polycarpi passio ad annum 175 pertinet; Basnagius in annum 178 mortem ejus rejicit."

Eusebius that he went to Rome, on account of the controversy then springing up between the Eastern and Western churches. What he did on his return however, we have scarcely any account of. That he was a faithful bishop unto the end we have every reason to believe, as well as the direct testimony of Irenaeus to this effect. His epistle to the Philippians, the only one that has come down to us, of the many others which this aged martyr without doubt wrote, affords also clear evidence of the same. To this we now turn our attention.

In this epistle, we do not find, it is true, the same explicitness in regard to the nature and constitution of the church as in the epistles of Ignatius, yet the relation in which Polycarp stood to Ignatius on the one hand, and to Irenaeus his disciple on the other, affords sufficient ground to convince us, in the absence of all direct testimony that his doctrine was essentially the same. The ground work however upon which the doctrine itself is based, and out of which it grows, forms as clearly the substance of Polycarp's thinking as that of his fellow disciple; for we have precisely the same conception of the person of Christ, and the same instinctive hostility to all heresy, especially that which in any way denies the real humanity of the Saviour. In c. i of this epistle he writes: "I rejoice greatly that the firm root of your faith until now remains, and brings forth fruit to our Lord Jesus Christ, who for our sins permitted himself to be brought to death. Whom God hath raised, having loosed the pains of hell (*ὅν ἤγειρεν ὁ Θεὸς, λύσας τὰς ὥδυνας τοῦ ᾄδου.* Acts ii: 24.) Here evidently the firm root of their faith is Jesus Christ, crucified and risen again. So immediately after in c. ii he enjoins a faithful submission to the mystery of Christ's resurrection and glorification: "Wherefore being girded in your loins, serve God in fear and in truth, laying aside all empty jangling and the error of the multitude, believing on him who raised our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead, and gave to him glory and a throne at his right hand; to whom all things in heaven and earth are subject; whom every spirit worships; who shall come, the judge of the living and the dead; whose blood God will require of those not believing him." Here the divine reality of Christ's death and resurrection is to be implicitly relied upon, and the least questioning concerning the same is but simply jangling and an evident wandering from the faith. Again in c. v he illustrates how a faithful subjection to these divine mysteries may be made tangible and real. In the first part of the chapter he considers the deacons "ministers of God and Christ (*in* Christ, according to some) and not of men" and then ex-

horts the young men at the close of the same chapter "to be subject to the presbyters and deacons as to God and Christ." The same order of subordination is here maintained as in the epistle of Ignatius, and for the same reason. The church here is made, not the organ of nature, but of that which is above nature. In the same manner as the conception, incarnation, death, resurrection and glorification of Christ are not simply natural events, but mysteries of faith, so is the church made a mystery precisely coordinate with them. All of these are made to enter with their full force as living factors into her constitution, as the body of Christ, the very fulness of him that filleth all in all. The whole conception which underlies the reasoning of Polycarp in the fifth and sixth chapters of this epistle, is precisely the same as that of the creed, in which the incarnation is made to repeat itself in the church, in the regeneration, christianization and resurrection of the world. How then is it possible, that the person of Christ should not be of fundamental consequence to his whole theology? A wrong conception here would overturn its whole structure. Hence it is that in the conclusion of the sixth chapter, and throughout the seventh he writes: "Let us therefore serve him in fear, being zealous about what is good (*τὸ καλόν*), holding ourselves back from scandals, and false brethren, and those bearing in hypocrisy the name of Christ, who mislead vain men. For every one who does not confess that Jesus Christ has come in flesh, is antichrist; and he who does not confess the martyrdom of the cross, is from the Devil; and he who perverts the oracles of the Lord to suit his own particular desires, and says that there is no resurrection or judgment, is the first born of Satan." And directly again in the eighth: "Therefore let us unceasingly persevere in our hope, and the pledge of our righteousness, which is Jesus Christ, who bore our sins in his own body upon the tree; who neither did sin nor was any guile found in his mouth; but for us suffered all things that we might live in him."

Polycarp's unfeigned grief on account of the fall of Valens, recorded in the 11th chapter, springs from the consciousness that he stood by virtue of his office in no ordinary relation to his flock. Upon no other ground is it based, and indeed this is the very first reason which he assigns for his affliction; for he says: "I am greatly afflicted for Valens, who was once a presbyter among you, that he should be so ignorant of the place which was given to him." The subsequent instruction given to the Philippian brethren, is the same in substance as that of Ter-

tullian in the third chapter of his book *De Praescriptionibus*.⁷ Polycarp however earnestly exhorts them to be charitable to those that have fallen away, and to "call them back as wandering and erring members, that their whole body may be saved, for thus each individual would be edified," and strengthens them with the following benediction: "Now may the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ the Son of God, himself the eternal High Priest, build you up in faith and truth, in all meekness and kindness, in patience and long suffering, in forbearance and chastity; and grant unto you a lot and portion among his saints; and us with you, and to all that are under the heavens, who shall believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and in his Father who raised him from the dead." After this benediction, Polycarp concludes his epistle by making inquiries in reference to Ignatius, and highly recommending his epistle to himself which he sent to them.

Whatever may be said of the peculiar doctrines of Ignatius and Polycarp, this much is clear, that the whole spirit of their epistles is Catholic. They could not have been written in any other place than in the bosom of the Catholic Church. The sacred humanity of Christ is always taken by them to be real. His incarnation is never made a visionary dream or mere phantasy, but a great and everlasting mystery; the solution of the great problem of salvation; the great fountain of life, whose waters have flowed over into the bosom of the church, there and there only to purify the fallen children of man. The resurrection is never considered an isolated event, having no direct relation to man, but in it fallen humanity is seen to come triumphant from the empire of the grave, and ascend in glory to the right hand of God. The church is never regarded as a voluntary association, or an aggregation of individual believers, but as the vast sanctuary where dwell the glorious mysteries of the upper world, at once, in the beautiful language of Lactantius "*fons veritatis, domicilium fidei, templum Dei*." Her voice is listened to by them as the voice of the Bride, saying to the exiled sons of Eve: Come from your long wandering and hopeless desolation, and enjoy the rest of faith.

E. E. H.

⁷ "Soli enim Dei Filio servabatur sine delicto permanere. Quid ergo, si episcopus, si diaconus, si vidua, si virgo, si etiam martyr lapsus a regula fuerit, ideo haereses veritatem videbuntur obtinere? Ex personis probamus fidem, an ex fide personas? Nemo sapiens est, nisi fidelis: nemo major, nisi Christianus: nemo autem Christianus, nisi qui ad finem usque perseveraverit."

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

Acts ii : 41-47.

It is impossible for a person to take any interest in the christian religion, without having his attention involuntarily drawn to its early history. The fact that the Church of Christ has in all ages been the most important power in the world, and has more deeply and permanently influenced the destinies of man than any other, would of itself invest its rise with the highest degree of interest to all intelligent persons. Learning and labor are everywhere expended in tracing back the history of empires and cities to their first feeble beginnings, and much valuable instruction is supposed to be derived from such investigations. No one can fail to be edified, or to be encouraged in honest and honorable undertakings, when he contemplates the humble, obscure origin of a city or an empire, as it serves to teach us the valuable lesson not to despise the day of small things, and that if we faint not, we shall reap in due time the reward of our labor and perseverance. The Church, however, differs from all merely human institutions, because she has in a special manner enlisted the affections of believers, and her past history is intimately connected with their present privileges, and highest enjoyments. The rise and fall of empires have but an indirect bearing upon the most important interests of men ; such events have neither brought them to occupy their present spiritual position, nor inspired them with warm hopes for the future ; whilst the Church has brought down on her surface from distant ages, our richest treasures, our faith, our hope, our all. Hence we naturally wish to know something of the source of this noble stream, that has ever continued to fertilize the world. We love to transport ourselves back to Eden, the origin of our race ; we walk through its bowers, and survey the beauty, the purity, the innocence of that lovely abode, when as yet our first parents had not sinned, nor brought death into the world. But Eden must ever awake painful as well as pleasant emotions in the mind. Its gates were closed after the transgression, and cherubim with flaming swords guarded the entrance. It passed away, and it now appears only as a sweet dream of youth, with the exception, that streams of death, instead of life, flowed from it into our world. The Eden of the new dispensation however, in which the Second Adam was placed, that he might dress it, still remains ; its gates have never been closed ; its plenty, its provisions, its blessedness, have been enjoyed by all

past generations, whilst generations as yet unborn will also pluck of its fruits, and live and never die.

The account of the church, as we have it in the second chapter of Acts, is a description of it in its first love. The Holy Ghost had descended and taken up his permanent abode in the hearts of believers. The impression, which he made upon their minds, was not a transient one; it remained, and the world had an opportunity to see the work of God in its living manifestations from day to day. Their Savior, whose absence they had mourned, had returned again in the plentiful effusions of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, to verify in their experience the truth of his promise, that he would be with them always to the end of the world. He came not in his visible, but his invisible presence; he was not seen by the eye but by faith, and the grief of separation was more than assuaged in the fuller manifestation of the glory of his person. It was the day of their regeneration. They were born of the Spirit. The fountain of life, which was contained in the person of Christ, but which could not as yet flow forth, was now opened, and poured out in rivers of living water into their hearts. They felt the power of the new life penetrating and animating their souls. They were drawn to Christ by a mysterious influence, of which they had not been conscious before. They were one with him, as the Father and the Son are one. Their imaginary fears vanished before the light of his presence, and neither a frowning, angry world, nor the malice of the Jews could any longer appal their hearts. Their own weakness, and apparently defenceless condition could not intimidate them in the least, for they had lost their fear of death in their vigorous faith in the resurrection. They who had but a short time before been a scattered flock retreating before the storm, had now become an organized body, presenting a front, which nothing could break. Their life at this time was a practical exhibition of the *communion of saints*, such as the world has not beheld since. It is the model of all Christian life, and the pattern, to which it should be the object of our labors and prayers to bring the divided Christianity of our age to conform. The subjoined remarks are designed as a contribution to so desirable an object.

I. The communion of the disciples, as of all true believers, consisted in their *union with one head*, the Lord Jesus Christ. As there is but one faith, so there is only one Lord. As there can be only one head in a sound and healthy body, so Christ can be the only common head of his church, the fulness of Him, that filleth all in all. The apostle says, that Christians

grow into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ, from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in love. Eph. 4: 10. The disciples were like sheep without a shepherd, until by the descent of the Spirit, they again embraced their returning Savior, and found in him a centre of unity. Now of a sudden they became an organized body, which no power on earth could dissolve; they no longer feared to meet the opposition of the world, and in accordance with the command of their Master, they not only resisted, but attacked it in the citadel of its strength.

The ideas of unity and communion imply necessarily some central power, around which the body that is united, may be said to revolve, or some foundation, upon which it may lean for support. In the natural world this is everywhere the case. The planets, the earth, and the moon roll round the sun, and are kept in their places by its attractive power; whilst the solar system together with the fixed stars, are supposed to be controlled by some very large body hid in the immensity of space. Empires, that extend their dominions from the rising to the setting sun, are kept together by a single throne, and fall again into a thousand fragments as soon as the throne is once overthrown. On a smaller scale we may see the same principle active in the family circle, where each member leans for protection and support upon the united head. Thus if there be such a thing as a church, or a communion of saints; if christianity aims at bringing the members of the human family together into a universal brotherhood, as a matter of the utmost importance; then it must proceed from a single person, be directed and controlled by him throughout.

This relation, which exists between Christ, and his people, making them one, is higher, more spiritual, and more holy than any similar relation, wherever it is found. It is not that of blind force as in nature; it is not that of tyranny, caprice, interest, or merely natural affection, as in the human world; it is a union, that results from a divine power, or a divine life, entering into the constitution of man from without, bringing the understanding into cheerful subjection, moulding the will, and attracting the affections with an irresistible power. The subjects of this influence are drawn silently towards Christ, who appears to them as the chiefest among ten thousand and the one altogether lovely. Hence there is a true communion of souls.

In the primitive church no name was mentioned with so much reverence, or produced such a sensation as that of Christ, the Son of God and man. Heresies respecting his person, character or work, immediately assumed the character of gross profanity, from which believers turned away with as much abhorrence, as if the most sacred persons or things had been profaned. Christ pervaded their hearts, lived among them, compassed their down-sittings and their up-risings, and through his Spirit ruled and reigned over them. Whatever of life, of activity, of courage, or strength, they possessed, they attributed to the same unfailing fountain-head.

There can be no unity, or communion among men, without the presence of such a Christ as we find revealed in Scripture, and meet in the onward progress of the Church's history. Such a one alone could possess the power of uniting into one them that are scattered abroad. The constitution of his person, as the God-man, uniting the divinity with human flesh, is of such a character, as to fit Him to be the only Mediator, that is qualified to restore mankind, rent into numberless atoms, into one family of peace, harmony, and love. Various principles and expedients have been employed to remedy the distracted state of the world, and to bring about a true and lasting union. For the most part it is supposed that a system of knowledge, or religious truths, will be able to effect this object. Mohammed and his followers imagined that their faith would eventually bring all men to rally around it. It was supposed that the crescent would continue to increase until it filled the world. Other religionists have been just as sanguine, that their doctrines would eventually become a centre of union for man. Some even now preach the same thing concerning their favorite systems. The ancient Greeks, who were possessed of such a refined taste, and love of harmony, with almost super-human effort endeavored to find the true system of the universe, and to reduce its various parts to order and harmony. They went upon the supposition, that some such a harmony existed, and that it only remained for the human intellect to find the thread, that was to lead them through the labyrinthian maze; they were unconscious, however, of the extent and prevalence of sin in the world, or of the disorders, to which it has given rise, and had no conception of the regeneration of the world. In their beautiful speculations and mythologies, there is an evident attempt to unite heaven with earth, to reconcile man with his Maker. Their systems, therefore, are purely ideal, and ended in nothing better than a cold pantheism, according to which the

Supreme Being is the soul of the world, and this latter is to be regarded as his body, which in its more beautiful manifestations, ought to be worshipped. To this result all earnest religious thinking must come, when it rejects the doctrine of the incarnation, or the presence of the human and divine Savior in the world. There can be no other divine presence among men, except that ethereal, unsubstantial one of the Greeks, if there be no Mediator between God and man, through whom the divine glory may be reflected upon man; and if Christ have no human nature, through which by the operation of the Spirit, man becomes allied and united to God, the Savior's presence in the world cannot have even as much force as that of the divine presence among the heathen. All attempts, therefore, to find a centre of unity among men, that leaves out of consideration an incarnate Redeemer, must in the nature of things prove a failure, or like the effort at the building of Babel to promote unity, only end in still greater confusion. Christianity has its doctrines also, its system of faith,—the best in the world, because they are true; but it has more: it has a *person*, who has power to draw all men unto him. Christ is the centre of all union and communion of spirit; he is the way, the truth, and the life; he is the Alpha, and Omega, the beginning and the end. He possesses the power of restoring men to true communion, because he is himself the beginning of the creation of God; because he occupies a central position, by virtue of which he can with one hand propitiate heaven and with the other reconcile man. Other foundation can no man lay, except that which is laid, which is Christ.

II. The communion of the first Christians, as of all true believers, consisted also in the *common enjoyment of the benefits of Christ*. First Christ, then his benefits. We must not confound the one with the other. First united with Christ, then as a consequence of this union, believers enjoy in common the benefits flowing from his life and his death. No persons ever had a clearer consciousness of the blessings of salvation than the disciples at Jerusalem. Their joy, their singleness of heart, above all their devotion to Christ, show how conscious they were of the grace of God. Nothing was too costly for them to sacrifice, in view of his favor to them; and of the tie which bound them to his person. Whatever may have been the darkness of their minds before, they now felt that their sins were pardoned; that they were redeemed from death and its power; that they were acceptable to the Father for the sake of the Son; that they were renewed, and assured of the Spirit's

influence to sanctify them, and to lead them into all truth ; that the victory over the world was guarantied to them by their Savior's victory ; and that they were entitled to a full participation in his kingdom, in his glory, and his throne. From the land of their exile they looked to their inheritance in the skies, whither they at length expected to return with the ransomed and redeemed with songs and everlasting joys upon their heads, to obtain joy and gladness, where sorrow and sighing shall flee away.

That special advantages shall accrue to believers in consequence of their living union with Christ ought to be self-evident, and that all the treasures of his riches become theirs, so far as they can be communicated to a finite creature like man, flows necessarily from the real unity which is established between them and Christ by the spirit. There is a parallel development in the life of Christ and of his people ; the same life of suffering and reproach which was endured eighteen hundred years ago in Palestine, modified by circumstances, is repeated in the life of every believer, that becomes one with him. It could not be otherwise ; else there could be no such an interpenetration of the divine life with the human subject, such as the scripture advocates. The christian, therefore, descends the vale of humiliation, in accordance with a law of his nature, which he cannot control, and agonizes in fierce conflict with the powers of darkness ; he bears the cross in the presence of the multitude, and submits to the horrors of crucifixion, that his old nature may be effectually destroyed, and his renewed nature rise to complete victory over sin and death. The opposition and alienation of the world are as sure to become his lot, as it was that of his Head : no laws of nature are more fixed, or inflexible. Thus in consequence of his oneness with Christ, he becomes a partaker of his sufferings. But if sufferings are entailed by the presence of Christ in his heart, the benefits of Christ must much more become his portion and inheritance. If suffering and death must be endured, life and immortality shall also be enjoyed. The christian rises with Christ over death, and carries with him the principle, that shall at last elevate him to a seat at the right hand of God in heaven. Possessing Christ as his portion, he possesses the power of his resurrection, and exaltation, and why not his throne and his kingdom, according to the language of Scripture ? unless this be the case his union with Christ does not amount to anything more than intimacy and friendship, where there is no union of nature, and no community of goods.

The enjoyments of the Savior's benefits are both subjective and objective. That men are made holy and sanctified by his presence, all observation goes to confirm, and he must doubt the truth and reality of the christian religion altogether, who denies that christians are conformed in heart and spirit to the image of Christ; but there has ever been a disposition among men to deny or ignore the objective benefits of Christ. Hence the sufferings of Christ are not regarded as vicarious, nor placed in any sense to the account of the sinner; his righteousness also is not imputed to him, as much as if he in his own person had wrought out that same righteousness by a life of perfect obedience. But who ever thought of making heaven, the glories of the lamb, the kingdom, and the treasures, that fade not, a mere subjective experience? The Christian world has ever regarded them as objective realities, which shall be conferred upon the saints at the last day, because they are members of Christ, and participators with him in his glory and inheritance. Why then shall the Christian not be entitled to something more than his subjective experiences in this world? His relation to Christ demands, that he already as an heir with Christ should be permitted to say of the merits and righteousness of Christ, they are mine, for I am Christ's, and Christ is mine. The gospel encourages the believer to strive to rise to the full assurance of faith, and to the full measure of Christian hope, and it would have him to look with disdain upon the bondage of fear, or doubt respecting the divine favor and approbation. He therefore forgets himself, and looks to Christ, in whom he finds righteousness and eternal life, freely granted to him, as a pure gift of love.

Benefits like these, whenever they come to be apprehended in their power and reality, bind those together, who enjoy them by inseparable ties. Common interests, common dangers, and a common destiny unite men everywhere into communities. The wicked are known to combine on this principle. Highwaymen and robbers often present a firm organization in the prosecution of their evil projects, and they forget their hatred of each other in the object of their plunder. Nations are consolidated in view of the common benefits, which accrue to them from their union, and a feeling of national love is excited, that binds its members together by the most intimate ties. But in all such cases, the interests are of a temporal character, and there are other opposing interests, which prevent them from becoming truly one. In all human combinations, the repulsive power of sin is actively at work to keep heart from heart, and hand from hand. In the

case of true Christians; however, in proportion as they approach the image of Christ, there are no such obstacles to communion: their interests, their hopes, as well as their dangers and difficulties are the same; their happiness here is drawn from the same fountain, and they look forward towards the same bright prospects in the skies. Their inheritance both in time and eternity is a common one, from which each may partake to the full extent of his capacity, and yet no one is impoverished. In regard to the goods of this world, we see a constant inequality in their distribution. They usually fall to the lot of a favored few, and the multitude, or the mass of men, can have no part in their enjoyment. In the struggle for honor, the laurel of victory is placed on a single brow, whilst others must suffer the pain of defeat. In the fight of faith, however, all that contend with faith receive the prize, and enjoy the common victory. Hence the rivalries, that distract and fret the world, are removed from the Christian communion, so soon as the communion of saints comes to be experienced and enjoyed. Worldly success, or prosperity are usually the cause of hatred, envy, or jealousy, whilst in the kingdom of Christ, the prosperity of the one is the prosperity of the other, and contributes to the happiness of all. When angels in heaven, who compose a part of this communion, learn of the conversion of sinners, they rejoice; and the triumphs of the cross excite the general joy of the church on earth. Thus when the Christians at Jerusalem learned that the Samaritans, and the Gentiles, whom they from their youth had despised, had received the Gospel, they praised God for his wonderful works. The partition walls, that antiquity, education, prejudice, and in some sense the divine authority had raised between Jew and Gentile fell to the ground, when the kingdom of heaven was opened, and all alike were invited to take possession of its treasures. Though many from the north and the south, from the east and the west, have accepted of the invitation to the supper of the Lord, yet every guest, as well as the master of the feast exclaims, there is yet room, and rejoices, when those from the high-ways and hedges of life are seen turning to partake of the repast. Common difficulties, trials, and opposition, excite generally a kindred feeling, and so it must be in the Christian life. The church as a body has ever been opposed by the world; and its individual members must in every age expect the repetition of the same assaults from the powers of darkness. The severity of the conflict opens the fountains of sympathy within, and erases the artificial distinctions, of station, birth, or property, on the broad plain of Christian love. But

when the soldier of the cross advances from battle to successive victories, and beholds around him the companions of his toils, and his trials, partaking with him in similar rewards, the feeling of fellowship is increased a hundred fold. Their affections were cemented, not merely in the sun-shine of prosperity, but in the storms of adversity; they entwined around each other in the hour of trial, and were forced to endure the rigors of the world's wintry days; but such an education as this has only served to give them vigor and hardihood; and now the remembrance of the past, its common sufferings and sorrows, adds increased relish to their present fellowship of love. The veterans of a hundred battle fields, as they live very much in the past, or in the fruits of the past, feel themselves separated from the generation around them, who move in entirely different relations, and form a community, with enjoyments peculiarly their own.

III. The communion of the saints, as experienced by the disciples at Jerusalem, consisted further in *unity of faith*. It is said they continued in the Apostles' doctrine. With the first disciples, the name of sect, of division, or party was unknown. There were none, who rose up to publish their discoveries in divine knowledge. They were all of one mind as it regarded the meaning of the Gospel. As there was but one Lord, so there was but one faith. The apostles had been divinely appointed to make known the faith, and the disciples as a matter of course received the truth at their hands. Reason had not assumed a hostile position to the divine teachings, nor questioned the truths of revelation. In the case of believers, it humbly sat at the feet of the apostles, as they had sat at the feet of the Lord, and consented to be instructed respecting the truths of salvation. There were no such questioning even as that of the serious Nicodemus, How can these things be? The question, which they asked was, What must we do to be saved? and when they were directed to be baptized, they gladly received the words of the apostles, and added themselves to the disciples of Christ, to the number of three thousand, that they might be daily learners of the heavenly mysteries.

The unity of faith, as it obtains in the fellowship of saints, is not of course a mere assent to what are generally regarded as orthodox truths, as these are revealed to us one after another. Like unity of any other kind, it implies a proper order and arrangement of different parts, the necessary dependence of one upon another, and of the whole upon that which is fundamental. The Christian faith is a full and complete unity in itself; it is a system, in which, what is fundamental takes the prece-

dence, and controls that which is subordinate throughout; it resembles a pyramid, resting on a broad basis, where the superincumbent material all contributes to the strength and solidity of the whole, and where the body rests firmly only as it occupies its natural position.

All persons who strive seriously to attain to the faith of the Gospel, seek after such a unity of the faith, as the apostle calls it. The human mind can never rest satisfied until it perceive some degree of harmony and order in its conceptions, and this is especially the case in its investigation of religious truths. Here more than anywhere else, it seeks for system, and if it does not find it in reality, it discovers one that is imaginary, and creates an ideal world of its own. But of all the attempts, that have been made, or are now making, to attain to unity in this respect, the failures are as numerous as they are melancholy, bringing confusion and disorder into the church, and all pious minds. It is not uncommon for us to behold a whole system of faith, made to rest upon what are entirely subordinate truths. The parties, the little sects, that spring up in the church from time to time, usually take as their basis some favorite doctrine from the scripture, or of their own manufacture, and proceed to erect the whole structure of the Christian faith *de novo*. Time would fail us to enumerate all such attempts; the history of the church is full of them, and the present age is full as productive of them as any other. The Universalist thinks, and talks, and preaches continually about his doctrine of universal salvation, and all his speculations revolve around his favorite topic; the Baptist is tempted to think that his peculiar method of baptism must take the precedence of all other subjects of religious enquiry, and immersion become the germinant point of his religious life and activity. Forms of church government may, under certain circumstances, become invested with the most absorbing interest to religious minds, even where they are separated from the ideas from which they spring, whilst such truths of scripture as are central and vital are overlooked or forgotten. Then the Presbyterian, the Episcopalian, or the Catholic may be led to regard his form of church polity, as involving the question of life and death, and he permits his religious thinking to be modified and controlled throughout by his ruling idea. But all such have not the unity of faith, as it was held in the days of the apostles, and of course wander from the communion of saints. Sects all spring from a wrong, and distorted view of the Christian faith; whatever of truth they may carry with them is partial, and torn from the living relations, in which it

stands in the scheme of the gospel; they are not the product of a healthy growth on the part of the church, but excrescences, the result of disease in the body, and often but little removed from heretics themselves. They can never attain to the unity of the faith, nor fully enter the communion of saints, as they indeed prove by their actions, for practically as well as theoretically they promote and encourage divisions in the body of Christ.

There are others, however, who seem to have the unity of the faith, at least according to their words, and yet in most cases, their profession is no more than the name, whilst the thing itself is neither felt nor understood. They say with Augustine, we agree in essentials and agree to disagree in non-essentials. This is happily expressed, and if men always did in fact and truth, what they profess, nothing more could be asked at their hands. But the previous questions ought first to be settled, What are essentials? and What are non-essentials? And what is it to hold an essential truth honestly and sincerely? What some regard as essential, others regard as non-essential, and contrariwise; and where there is an agreement in such truths as we find in the *Apostles' Creed*, there may be little unity in fact; it may be a purely intellectual agreement, that does not affect the heart, nor produce any true faith. It is quite possible for an individual to receive such a doctrine as the providence of God, or the incarnation of Christ, as a fact or a truth of essential importance in the Christian faith, and yet regard them with the cold eye of the intellect, and perceive only their remotest bearings upon the salvation of the world. They may be looked upon very much as the physical act of creation, which as a fact, was indispensable to the execution of redemption. Thus whilst the Creed is repeated and professed, the heart may rest after all exclusively upon the isolated fact of the Saviour's death, and make it the sole essential article of faith. The early disciples also professed, and actually did agree in essentials, and agreed to disagree in what was not essential. The holy communion which bound them together, allowed them to think differently on subjects of no vital importance, but at the same time brought them to a true unity in such truths, as were essential in the body of Christian truth. In their cases, however, it was not a matter of dispute as to what constituted the foundation and life of the truth. This they received at the hands of the Apostles, and as already said they continued in the Apostles' doctrine. If we turn to the discourse of Peter on the day of Pentecost, we may see the sum of the truth, into which they were led by the Holy

Ghost. Peter was the great representative of the disciples, and the organ through which the church proclaimed to the world the wonderful works of God; his discourse was without any doubt a correct expression of their faith: the successive truths to which he gave utterance, was the basis upon which their minds and hearts rested with a firm and unwavering confidence, upon which their thoughts and affections dwelt with unspeakable delight, and in which they now, by the descent of the Spirit, beheld a peculiar beauty, and adaptedness to their circumstances as perishing sinners. In that memorable discourse the truths, which were proclaimed to the world as Christianity, consisted of the miraculous birth, sufferings, death, resurrection, and exaltation of Christ to the right hand of the Father, as the mediator, whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead,—the outpouring of the Spirit, the forgiveness of sin, the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting. These facts together with the eternal counsel and providence of the Father, constituted the sum and substance of the Apostles' doctrine. It was certain undeniable facts, revealed to them by the Spirit, that constituted the objects of their faith, and not any specious theory elaborated in the schools; for it is contrary to reason and the circumstances of the case, for us to attribute to the Apostles or their followers refined and abstruse speculations. Christianity is no theory, but a revelation of certain mysterious facts, all centering in the person of Christ, requiring our implicit faith, if we are ever to enter into communion and fellowship with Him. It was the knowledge of these, that constituted the unity of faith among the first converts, and brought them together into Christian fellowship,—into holy communion with each other. They had found that which is truly fundamental in the Christian faith, upon which the whole structure of their knowledge and Christian life was to be erected. They were guided by a more unerring light than that of natural reason, to unite their hearts upon such a foundation as they found in the Apostles' doctrine. Resting upon this all other truths naturally found their proper place in the mind, and they were at the same time supplied with a sure test, by which they were enabled to prove all things, and to hold fast to that which was good.

To attain then to the unity of the faith, and by consequence to the communion of saints, we must honestly and with discernment adopt the Apostles' doctrine, which as we have seen, is substantially the same as that which is commonly known as the Apostles' Creed. It is not required of us to commence speculating with the view of arriving at this unity: the disciples

did not do so, and they who trust to the wandering light of their own reason, stray from the truth into swampy ground, where they sink at length to the darkness of eternal night. What is necessary to introduce men into the kingdom of heaven is, that they receive with implicit faith, the truth, which in the early history of Christianity, made converts to Christ by thousands and tens of thousands, that is, a faith in the Father, in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost; in the fact that there is a divine providence: that Jesus, the Son of God, was born of the Virgin Mary, was crucified, dead, and buried; that he rose from the dead, and now sits at the right hand of the Father, whence he sends his Spirit to convert and regenerate the world, and whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead; and so on in the order of the Creed.

The disciples had been made acquainted with these, and were eye-witnesses of them, and yet they did not comprehend them until the descent of the Spirit; they had seen with their eyes, but not with their hearts, they had heard with their ears, but not with their understanding. The eye of faith had not been opened, and as they saw no power, no glory in the facts of the Saviour's life, they could discern no glory in his person. Now, however, they had learned to see the significance of what before had been closed up to their view: they had found a path which no fowl knoweth, and which the vulture's eye hath not seen: the lion's whelps have not trodden it, nor the fierce lion passed by it, Job xxviii chap. There was we say a deep significance in the divine facts, which they had not perceived before, but which they now by the aid of the Spirit discovered. They felt it themselves, and were impelled to reveal it to all nations in their various languages. Peter arose without the least disturbance or confusion of mind, and narrated with the utmost clearness the history of Christ, which made such an impression on the minds of others, that thousands were pricked to the heart, and led to rejoice in the new revelations.

We may examine some of the facts, to which Peter refers, with the view of discovering the power they had of uniting all hearts upon them.

First we may consider the fact of the incarnation. This is included in all that Peter said. He calls him Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God, the seed of Abraham, and solemnly affirms, that he is both Lord and Christ. He refers to the passage in the Psalms, where the Father says to the Son, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool. Was there then nothing in the mystical union of the human

and divine natures in Christ, that was calculated to affect their hearts and to raise their hopes? To them as Jews this fact was invested with special interest, for the Messiah had not only assumed human nature in general, but was of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh. A man of their own nation, who was bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh, by the counsel of God, was exalted to an equality with Jehovah. He who had lived in their society, walked through their streets, and spent his life among them, was the Son of God, the Redeemer of the world. It was necessary in the nature of the case that the nearness of their relation to the Son of God, should excite their hope, their love, their confidence. Had a Jew risen up among them, and like another Alexander carried his conquests over the world, the Jews everywhere should have considered themselves greatly honored by their connection with him, and felt themselves safe under his reign, as he was of common origin with themselves. But here was a far greater conqueror than Alexander, one who had subdued the world, trod down the powers of darkness, and made himself Lord of the visible and invisible worlds; and yet this Lord of Lords, and King of Kings, carried with him their own flesh and blood. Such a Mediator as this necessarily excited their faith and hope, so soon as his glory and power were revealed to them by the Holy Ghost. He allied them to God, and introduced them into a life-union with the divine nature: he was the medium, through which they might ascend to the heights of glory: as they were new creatures they no longer traced their origin from below, but from above; they were no more the children of this world, but the children of God, they were born from above, and as each member saw himself in the common stream of life and immortality proceeding from God, a family feeling was engendered in his heart, that bound him to others in the like happy situation.

The death of Christ was another truth into which the disciples were led by the Spirit. This is distinctly referred to by Peter. To their minds it was more than a very extraordinary occurrence, as where innocence is outraged, and rewarded with a cruel death; it was more than the highest example of suffering patience, sustained throughout, not by stoic submission, but by the utmost patience and the loftiest dignity. The whole transaction was adapted to satisfy a felt want of their hearts. He had died the just for the unjust, and taken their place at the bar of divine justice; in his dying agonies he had endured the wrath of God against sin, and delivered them from the curse of the law; their consciences were now satisfied, and they were

enabled to look up hopefully for the favor of God. They had felt deep longings for salvation before, as all serious persons do, and their religious consciousness told them, it was not to be found in their present situation and circumstances. They now more than realized their aspirations in the tragic scene enacted before their eyes on Calvary. Once the cross and a suffering Saviour had filled them with grief, and served to remind them only of the loss they should sustain, when the Shepherd should be stricken and the sheep scattered abroad. Now, however, a glory beams around that cross, and the darkness of Calvary gives way to the light of Gospel hope. They with their immediate successors in the church seemed to know nothing but Christ and him crucified, and the fire of their new emotion could not be contained within their own breast, but compelled them to proclaim the good news in all places to the end of the earth. Their deepest wants were satisfied, because they regarded Christ as their spiritual head, and felt assured that his sufferings and death, were as much theirs as Christ had become theirs, by assuming their nature. As they were one with Christ, the terrible sufferings of the cross, accomplished in their view the same objects, and secured the same ends, as if they individually had endured them. Their cross-bearing, agonizing, wounded, bleeding, dying Saviour, so far from being a single, isolated person, appeared to them, to embrace all destitute, condemned, dying sinners in his embrace, and as their head and representative, to perform, what they the body could not perform themselves. His blood falling to the earth, was like a fruitful shower, whose benefits all alike might enjoy. Their fellowship in his sufferings, therefore, linked together the inmost fibres of their hearts' affections. The same faith produces the same results, and such as are not Jews, have risen to the same assurance of the fact, that they are related to Christ, and as members of the same family, embraced in the boundlessness of his mercy.

The resurrection and exaltation of Christ are especially insisted upon by Peter in his discourse. They settled beyond a doubt the truth of his Messiahship; but there was in these facts, as well as in his incarnation, and death, something that addressed the heart, and impressed it. They were not isolated facts, that merely manifested the power of their Master and Teacher; if they had been so, they could have had no other effect upon them, than to excite their wonder and admiration. As he died for them, he also rose for them, and took his seat at the right hand of the Father in their behalf. In the open grave, and the triumph of Christ over death, they saw their own victory over

sin and death. The same Saviour, who in his own body, accomplished such a work, would accomplish a similar work in their bodies at the last day. With the presence of Christ in their hearts, which was to be, moreover, an abiding one, they already felt the power of his resurrection, and had at the same time an earnest of their own. Hence their joy; hence death and the grave were divested of their terrors, and they who a short time before feared so much for their lives, became an organized band, ready to meet death in its most fearful forms. Christ himself had lain in the grave, and cast around its gloom a flood of heavenly light; he had sanctified it, and made it the quiet sleeping place of the saints. But he had overcome death, and issued forth as its glorious conquerer, teaching his people that they too shall rise from the dead.

But as Christ did not only rise from the dead, but was exalted to a seat at the right hand of the Father, and made equal with him in authority and power, their resurrection at the last day appeared to be an object unspeakably desirable. A merely temporal life at the end of the world could not thus excite their hopes. They looked unto Jesus at the right hand of the Father, and with a strong faith hoped to share with him in his crown and throne. Their common nature, thus exalted and glorified, was to them a pledge and guaranty of their own individual exaltation, as it is of all believers. Of one faith, they were of one hope; united in the same bright anticipations in time, they expected to be more closely united, when time should be no more, a thought, which cemented them together, as much as their common enjoyments.

For want of room this article will be finished in a succeeding number.

Mercersburg, Pa.

T. A.

THE ANTI-CREED HERESY.

WE have had ample opportunity already to expose the opposition, in which much of our Christianity at this time stands to the true sense and spirit of the Apostles' Creed.

Unitarianism rejects it as a matter of course. So also the whole Baptist body. But the case is not materially better with Puritanism in general. The Puritan Recorder has boldly avowed the fact that the Creed and Puritanism have not a kindred spirit, that in truth they mutually exclude each other, and cannot stand together, except as the first is taken in a wholly *non-natural* sense, and made to mean just the contrary of what it was taken to mean in the ancient church. We have found the N. Y. Observer denouncing also the principle and theory of this ancient faith, in similar radical style, as the beginning of an apostacy which is supposed to have turned the whole church into a synagogue of Satan.

In the last number of the Princeton Repertory, the Rev. Dr. Proudfit, of New Brunswick, has a long and labored article on the Apostles' Creed, which we are sorry to say falls into substantially the same heretical pravity. Our limits here will not allow us to notice it at much length. Nor is that necessary. Enough, that we bring into view simply its leading points, drawing them forth from the mass of irrelevant learning in which they are buried and hid. The article needs no other exposure.

Dr. Proudfit tries hard in the first place to make something dreadful, out of the light in which the Creed is presented by our articles in the first volume of the Mercersburg Review. He will have it, that we make the intuitional consciousness of the Church the fountain of a Divine revelation in some way, independently of the word of God which is contained in the Bible; and with his characteristic dishonesty goes so far even as to insinuate that we follow Strauss as a master, because we had said somewhere that his work shows the necessity of looking for the ground of Christianity in something deeper than the mere outward text of the sacred books, which give us an account of what it was in the beginning. Had we said that Gibbon's abuse of Church History shows the necessity of looking beyond its external facts and persons to the Divine life which was in them, in the style for instance of Neander, there would have been precisely the same room for charging us with taking lessons of an infidel. It is wonderful however how much of this

nasty sort of art and trick our Brunswick Professor has. It seems to be part of his nature.

The view we have taken of the Creed is simple enough. We have granted, that it was not from the start, as to letter and form, just what we find it to be in the fourth century. In spirit and substance however it was always the same, any modifications it experienced being nothing more in fact than the bringing out of the sense which had been in it from the beginning. In this view it dates from the time of the Apostles. To say that it was drawn from the New Testament Scriptures is simply absurd; because these were not in existence when the faith of the Church started, and came not into their present canonical form for at least a hundred years after. During all this time however the Church had a rule of faith, a fixed and settled norm of doctrine, everywhere acknowledged and received. This had its seat of course in the life of the Church itself, in the fact of what Christianity was to the consciousness of her actual faith; but we have never dreamed certainly of making it for this reason the product of this subjective consciousness as such. It had its origin and ground in the objective revelation of Christianity itself, as an outward supernatural fact. This was primarily Christ himself, as in Peter's great confession. Afterwards we have it in full outline in the preaching of the Apostles; from which it passed into the consciousness of the Church; where under the promised guidance of the Spirit it was kept afterwards to its true and proper form, as already mentioned. The Church exercised no other intuition in the case, than that of apprehending and holding fast in such way, under this promised guidance, the real objective supernatural mystery of godliness which had thus been committed to her by the living Christ and his living Apostles in the beginning, and long before the authoritative publication of the N. T. Scriptures, as a more ample record of the same glorious revelation, under her auspices and care; a work for which, as well as for her most faithful guardianship of these "oracles of God," through the long night of the dark ages, (when she was herself so completely sold as some tell us to the powers of hell,) we owe her a debt of filial gratitude and love greater than can be well expressed.

Let Dr. Proudfit and all others whom it may concern, make themselves easy on this point. We have no sympathy with the intuitionism of Schleiermacher or Morell. We hold Christianity to be a strictly objective supernatural revelation, a mystery in this view wholly above nature both logical and material, which can be apprehended only through faith and by a new

understanding given to us for the purpose by the Son of God alone.

But let *our* view of the Creed now pass. What we have to do with here is the view taken of it by Dr. Proudfit. His object in trying to set aside our representation, is to make room for another conception which may strip the symbol of its binding authority altogether. It came not in full form as we have it now from the Apostles; it abounded at first in variations; it underwent some additions; *therefore* it is of no Apostolical necessity for faith. So Puritanism is wont to argue. We undertook to show, that these premises rightly understood led to no such conclusion; because the variations and additions were never such as to change at all the proper unity and sameness of the Creed, in its essential constitution. The *regula fidei* on which the Church stood from the first, was just the substance of this glorious confession, handed forward from age to age in the life of faith. The Creed is the mirror of this faith as it had been received from the Apostles; and no other form of words can be said to represent truly and rightly the original fact of the Christian revelation. Against this Dr. Proudfit, we say, tries to fight as he best can. He wishes to have it thought, that the Creed had no fixed character in the beginning; that it was formed loosely at first from the Scriptures according to the private judgment of separate churches; that its variations prove the churches to have been much in the same state with our modern Independent ecclesiastical organizations, each of which claims the right of making its own creed in its own way; and that it is injurious to the Bible accordingly to attribute to it any binding authority whatever in determining the true sense of Christianity. If this be not what the article means, we know not how to find in it any meaning whatever.

Here then we have the heresy of the Puritan Recorder openly paraded in the pages of the Princeton Repertory, by a learned Professor of the Reformed Dutch Church! For let it be observed, the question is not at last whether our theory of the rise of the Creed is to be considered correct or not; but whether the Creed, *however it may have risen*, is to be regarded as still truly and really the norm, as far as it goes, the fixed doctrinal matrix and mould of the Christian faith for all ages. It was so regarded, we know, in all ages before the Reformation. It was so regarded also by the first Protestant Churches. Dr. Proudfit makes a show indeed of proving the contrary, by quoting passages from their Confessions that make the Bible to be the rule of faith against all human traditions. But this is pitiful quib-

bling. They professed notwithstanding to hold fast to the Creed as a true exposition of the Christian faith. They never dreamed of sundering the Bible from the mind of the Church as it had stood in previous ages in every form and shape, and turning it over to the judgment of any and all persons for such interpretation as might happen to seem fit. They owned the necessity of a confessional *norm* for the right use of the Bible; and the necessary beginning of this, the archetypal and primitive symbol of Christianity, they acknowledged to be the Apostles' Creed. However it might have come to its present settled form, they held it to be a true expression of what the Christian faith was as received by the Church in the first ages from the Apostles, from which as a rule of belief the same Church in later times had no right to depart. But this is just what the article before us is not willing to admit; for the admission would be at once fatal to its whole argument.

True, the article affects to speak respectfully of the Creed. Ursinus, Vossius, Heidegger, we are told p. 614, enumerate as catholic or universal the Apostolic, Nicene, and Athanasian creeds; and among these "the shortest, simplest, most comprehensive, and most strictly scriptural is without doubt the Apostolic." But then the drift of the whole discussion notwithstanding is to make this acknowledgment of no force. There is no conflict among these catholic creeds. They are strictly the *one* faith of the primitive church; and one must be interpreted by the rest to be of any real force. This fact however Dr. P. seeks to hide. His art is to throw all as much as possible into uncertainty and confusion. Then the Creed is for him a mere bundle of received maxims, brought together in a simply outward way; than which no conception can be more false or more contrary to sound faith. It is a most perfect unit; an organism, in which every part is true only as it grows forth from the whole. It is a mirror reflecting thus at every point the original life of the universal church. This Dr. P. has no power to see; and so he will not allow it to be of true symbolical authority, in its own whole and only true original sense, for the interpretation of the Bible. He shows throughout a strong dislike to this sense, especially as it comes to view in the article of the church as the organ and medium of salvation; and openly repudiates as contrary to the Scriptures the whole sacramental and mystical side of Christianity, without which the Creed for the first Christians would have had no meaning whatever.

But what need is there of analysis to make out the point, that Dr. Proudfit rejects the authority of the Apostles' Creed, as the

fundamental rule and norm of the Christian faith ? In no other view, can his article be taken to have any sense. Is not this just what he finds fault with in the *Mercersburg Review*, that it seeks to bind the interpretation of the Bible by the Apostles' Creed ? Either he honestly holds the Creed, as we have it and however it came, for such a symbol, or he does not. If he does so hold it, what ground of quarrel can he have with us for allowing to it the same authority ? If not, what farther proof is wanted to fix upon him, in common with Unitarians and Baptists, the stigma of the Anti-Creed heresy ?

To sustain himself in his desperate position, he finds it necessary in the next place to contend that the faith of the first ages was based upon the independent use of the Bible, without any other standing rule of faith, in the pretended style of the modern sect system ; and he has the hardihood to think of forcing this outrageous misrepresentation, not only upon the times of Irenaeus and Tertullian, but even upon the Nicene period itself !

Is it asked now, by what *hocus-pocus* this feat of historical legerdemain is performed ? We answer, it is done in the simplest and most *characteristic* way imaginable. The whole art and mystery of the thing consists in shifting the point in debate, so as to make it turn on the question only whether the early church regarded and used the Holy Scriptures as of Divine authority in matters of religion ; about which, so far as we know, there never has been any sort of doubt. Will it be believed, that so learned a man as the Rev. Dr. Proudfit of New Brunswick lays himself out systematically to prove, by quotation upon quotation, first that Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, &c., and then that Athanasius, Chrysostom, Basil, the Gregories, &c., of a later day, all held and taught the inspiration and binding authority of the Scriptures in the Christian Church ; and that this should then be gravely taken by him as proof, that they owned and acknowledged no guiding rule, no governing norm, for determining *the true sense of these Scriptures*, but left it to private judgment to settle their sense as it best could on the outside of the Church ?

The thing is absolutely ridiculous. Who does not know that the Fathers all held the Bible in the highest veneration ? The Catholic Church has always honored it as of Divine authority. We owe the sacred deposit altogether to her care. She formed the canon of the New Testament, deciding what it should contain and what it should not contain, and affixing to it the stamp of inspiration. And what she produced in such form, she has most religiously and faithfully preserved through all ages.

Without her *imprimatur* and seal now, all would be thrown into loose uncertainty and doubt. There can be no firm faith in the inspiration of the Scriptures, where there is no faith in the mystery of the Church. So Augustine teaches;¹ and so too we are taught by the Creed. And yet here we have the champion of Puritanism holding up the faith of the early fathers in the inspiration of the Scriptures, as in and of itself a conclusive argument that they had no sense of any Divine authority in the Catholic Church. Could nonsense well be more egregious!

Only think of Tertullian's tract on *Prescription* being quoted, to prove just the opposite of the whole argument in which it deals; that is, to make it appear that the Bible is the rule of faith, aside from the tradition of the Church, in the hands of the faithful and of all sorts of heretics alike! What then *was* his famous argument against heretics? Who does not know, that his whole object is to reduce the determination of what is Christianity, and so of course the interpretation also of the Bible, to a standard of faith already actually at hand in the church, which was supposed as such to have come down from the time of the Apostles?²

The use made of Irenaeus is equally absurd. For the object he aims at, Dr. Proudfit's quotations absolutely stultify themselves. For instance: "We must betake ourselves to the Church," writes this Father, "and be brought up in her bosom, *and nourished by the Scriptures of the Lord.*" What does this mean, but that the right use of the Bible is confined to the Church; which he compares immediately after with a paradise in the world, within which the Scriptures as trees bear fruit, for such only of course as are *there* and not on the outside—the very same thought that we find so familiar afterwards to Cyprian? Yet this passage Dr. P. quotes, italicising the last clause, to prove these trees of salvation *not* confined for their right use to

¹ Witness his memorable word: "Ego vero evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholicae ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas."

² In dealing with heretics, he tells us *De Praesc.* c. 18, the right order of controversy requires that we should settle first: "Quibus competat fides ipsa? Cujus sint scripturae? A quo, et per quos, et quando, et quibus sit tradita disciplina qua fiunt Christiani?" And then he adds: "Ubi enim apparuerit esse veritatem et disciplinae et fidei christianae, illic erit veras scripturarum et expositionum et omnium traditionum christianarum." This is certainly plain enough. The only true sense of the Bible is that which agrees with the mind of the Church; and where is this norm to be had primarily if not in her established universal creed or scheme of faith?

the garden of the Lord's planting; or to show, in other words, that Irenaeus made the Bible the source of Christianity without the Church.

But what shall we say of his attempt to Puritanize the Nicene Period, in the same violent style? Our statement, that the fathers of this time "knew nothing of the view which makes the Bible and private judgment the principle of Christianity or the only rule of faith"—that the order of doctrine for them was the Apostles' Creed," he flatly denies; and anon sallies forth, in true Don Quixote style, to accumulate citations from Athanasius, Hilary, Victorinus, Cyril of Jerusalem, the Gregories, Ephraim the Syrian, Basil, and Chrysostom, page piled upon page, to make good the temerarious contradiction. He does prove indeed triumphantly that these worthies speak in the most exalted terms of the Bible, (as the Catholic Church has always done,) and that they made much account of inward personal religion also, as distinguished from dead outward forms; and so he draws what he conceives to be his invincible ERGO: That they owned no Divine tradition of faith, no fixed creed, in the living Church as such, and knew nothing of Divine sacraments and true priestly functions in the style of the later Catholic system! It would be a pity to disturb the self-complacent serenity of such a notable *non sequitur*, by any show of serious resistance. We leave it alone in its glory.

We have never pretended to quote testimonies from the Nicene Period, for the purpose of proving that it was prevailingly Catholic and not Puritan. Why carry coals to Newcastle or Mauch Chunk? That is a fact too well settled certainly for any honest controversy or debate. We have referred before to Isaac Taylor's *Ancient Christianity*. It is enough now to refer to it again. Much as we dislike the theological animus that reigns in it, its simply historical positions on this point are of

* Here he charges us with *misstating* the case we oppose, by joining *private judgement* with the Bible. We beg leave however to retort the charge on himself and his school. To talk of the Bible as a principle or rule, *aside* from all judgment or interpreting sense, is downright childishness. The whole question regards the mind or judgment by which it is to be interpreted. Without some such mind, it never can become a principle or rule of anything. What we maintain is, that it must be read with the mind of the Church, which starts in the Apostles' Creed. Not so, says Dr. P. & Co.; *that* is to put it under the church; it must be read by some *other* mind, by *our* mind, by the mind of this or that sect; by every body's mind to suit himself. And what is this, we ask now, but to make the Bible and *private judgement* the principle and rule of Christianity!

unanswerable force. Let Dr. Proudfit meet them fairly if he can. Till he does so, it is breath spent in vain, to think of making good Puritans out of the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries. They were as far as they well could be from anything of that sort.¹

"I firmly believe," says Taylor, "that it were on the whole better for a community to submit itself, without conditions, to the well known Tridentine Popery, than to take up the Christianity of Ambrose, Basil, Gregory Nyssen, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine. Personally, I would rather be a Christian after the fashion of Pascal and Arnold, than after that of Cyprian or Cyril." We confess ourselves to be very much of the same mind.

When Dr. P. is done with Isaac Taylor, he may try his polemical hand, if he see proper, with the masterly work of Richard Rothe, entitled *Die Anfänge der christlichen Kirche*. This leaves little to be done, in the way of learning, for settling the view taken of the *Church* in the second and third centuries. When Dr. P. shall have answered it, we will begin to think

¹ We are glad to find that Dr. Ludlow, associated with Dr. P. now in the New Brunswick Institutions, in his late *Inaugural Discourse*, has taken the true view of facts here, directly in the face of his learned colleague. He quotes with approbation Taylor's judgment concerning the Romanizing tendencies of the Early Church back even to the second century, and then adds:

"The candid inquirer after truth will be amazed to find upon what a slender, precarious, visionary foundation the most strenuous endeavors were made in the ancient Church to create for her an all-absorbing, overpowering hierarchy. He will mark with surprise how soon new offices, forms, rites, ceremonies, were introduced. He will learn with no less astonishment that the custom of praying for the dead was universal; a custom of as high antiquity as any part of Christian worship which is not authorized by the inspired writings. Indeed, it is wanting no kind of support except from the holy Scriptures. Not much less may be said of the doctrines of celibacy and virginity, which seemed stealthily to make their way from the very days of the apostles, and were gradually growing into favor, until they received the sanction of the Synods of the Church, a little more than two centuries after the last of the apostles had departed. These doctrines, so pernicious to the morals and piety of the Church, so far from being opposed, were inculcated and lauded by all the Nicene fathers with scarce an exception. To these doctrines must be added the appointment of numerous days of feasting and fasting; rules and regulations in regard to meats and drinks; various appendages to the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper; veneration for relics; the worship of martyrs; pilgrimages to holy places, and the formal establishment of Monachism. And all this within the period of those three centuries from which we are to derive the model of a perfect Church."

that his vain babbling about the Christianity of this early time, is entitled to some little respect.

The case is abundantly clear. The faith of the Early Church is eternally imbedded in the Apostles' Creed. So, and not otherwise, the fact of Christianity was understood and embraced in the first ages. So the Bible was read, and not in any different *private* sense. This was the ground form in which the Christian consciousness, the universal mind of the Church, met and embraced by faith the corresponding substance of the Christian revelation, as it was preached by the Apostles and so passed over into the Sacred Writings. The Church had, it is true, different Creeds. But these were all in their fundamental conception and scheme one and the same; and this outline we have faithfully presented to us in the Apostles' Creed. There is no disagreement at all between it and the Nicene Creed for instance, or that of Athanasius. The proper identity of the symbol is not just in its so many clauses or words, but in its reigning idea rather, its grand *projection* of the primary facts of the "Mystery of Godliness." In this view, it gives us undoubtedly the true *regula fidei* of Primitive Christianity; and has always been regarded accordingly as of *oecumenical* or universal authority; not of course as excluding other symbols more extensive and full, but still in such a way as to require that these should grow forth from it, have their root in it and be a true carrying out of its sense, in order to be of any like oecumenical right and force.' The scheme of faith it presents is, for any

' Dr. P. affects to be scandalized at our saying, that "the article of justification by faith itself is turned into a perilous lie," if it be sundered from the scheme of truth exhibited in the ancient creeds. This only shows, however, the weak sense he has of the organic nature and true objective reality of the Christian faith. There is no such thing as getting to the doctrine of justification, or any other doctrine, legitimately and so that it shall be truly a part of the "One Faith" originally delivered to the saints, without beginning with the elementary form of this faith as it lies before us in the Apostles' Creed; for that can be no true fruit of Christian thought and feeling certainly, and so no true sense either of the Bible, which is not produced from the root of all Christian doctrine as it has entered into the very life of the Church from the beginning. Even what may be a sound doctrine in word must become false and dangerous in fact, if it be not apprehended under such felt relation to the unchangeable *incunabula* of Christianity, as they are here presented to our view, but be held as something brought in from a wholly different sphere of thinking. And there is no doubt whatever, that the article of justification by faith, as it is practically carried out by some of our unsacramental sects, which despise the Creed and resolve the Church into a Gnostic fiction, is just in this way converted

honest and tolerably well informed person, sufficiently plain. It is the same that we meet with on every page of the ancient Fathers, and in all the institutions of the early Church. It is constructed throughout on the Catholic, as distinguished from the modern Puritan habit, of mind. Its articles are all mysteries. They set before us an order of things above nature, which is yet taken to be really at hand, as the presence of a new creation in the world, accomplishing its own supernatural ends. The scheme is sacramental, in the very sense which is so distasteful to the Gnostic spiritualism of the present day. This is felt at once in the article of the *Holy Catholic Church*, with its communion of saints and remission of sins. The article may be indeed construed to mean an invisible church simply, where grace works without sacraments. But then it is forced out of its proper historical sense. It had no such meaning for the early ages; and no such meaning falls in fairly with the scheme and scope of the symbol as a whole. The *Church* here spoken of is a real mystery derived through the Holy Ghost from the fact of the Incarnation—the Body by which Christ as Head works in the world—the ark of salvation—an object in this view of faith—just as it comes before us in the writings of Irenaeus, Cyprian, and all the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries. Through her is the forgiveness of sins accordingly, the communion of saints, the resurrection of the body and life everlasting. The forgiveness of sins thus refers immediately to baptism; as we have it explicitly brought out in the Nicene Creed: “I confess one baptism for the remission of sins.” In all this we are offering no doubtful speculation. We simply state a fact which allows no contradiction. This is the system of Christianity taught in the Apostles’ Creed, and held in the beginning by the whole Church.

But now just this scheme of Christianity Dr. Proudfit, with the whole spiritualistic school to which he belongs, has no mind or heart to accept. Everything like a churchly, priestly, sacramental religion, is for him the abomination of Romanism itself. He can subscribe to the Creed, if he be allowed to do so with vast mental reservation, in a non-natural sense, “foisting into” it a meaning to please himself; but not otherwise. He believes

into a fearful falsehood, that is doing more mischief on all sides than can easily be told. No theology can be orthodox, no religion safe, no faith more than spiritual fancy we fear, that does not breathe throughout a filial unconstrained and unaffected veneration for the *Symbolum Apostolicum*, in its original and only proper sense.

in no descent to hades, no continuation of the glorified resurrection life of Christ *ἐν μυστηρίῳ* here below, no supernatural church, no remission of sins, no communion of saints living and dead, *in the sense of this primitive symbol.* This implies a want of harmony with the symbol throughout. For these points are not in their place by accident. They belong to the life of the symbol as a whole. Not to see and feel this, is itself not to own the mystery of the faith it proclaims. It is only in keeping then with such unbelief, that the Puritanism of Dr. Proudfit refuses to see in this ancient oecumenical symbol the necessary matrix of all true Christian theology, and so the only sure primary norm and analogy of faith for the true understanding of the Scriptures. He will have it, that we are bound now by no such rule, but have a perfect right to re-cast the entire fact of Christianity in a different mould, as to *our own judgment* construing the Scriptures may seem best; so that the fact shall be to us something wholly different from what it once *was*, for the mind of the Church just after the time of the Apostles, and yet all be right and safe notwithstanding because we pretend to have found it in the Bible!

This is monstrous certainly. But it is no caricature. It does not, we think, exaggerate Dr. Proudfit's error in the least. If the interpretation of the Bible is to be set free from the authority of the Apostles' Creed, it is vain to talk of its being bound by any other symbolical authority derived from the ancient church. And how then can any modern symbol be allowed to have any such force? What right can the Belgic Confession or the Heidelberg Catechism now have to govern our theology, or be-spectacle our reading of the Holy Scriptures, where the first mirror of the Christian faith itself, the root of all symbols, the underlying foundation of all that is oecumenical in the belief of the Christian world, is thus roughly required to stand back, and make room for the glorious, divinely sacred rights of Private Judgment! To such gross monstrosity, most plainly, the precious theory must necessarily come at the last. In nothing short of this can it possibly pause or rest for a single moment.

What can be more preposterous in these circumstances, than to pretend, as Dr. Proudfit does, to make common cause in any way notwithstanding with the theological life of the ancient fathers? That *their* religion was cast throughout in the mould of the Apostles' Creed, is just as clear as the fact that the sun shines. They magnified the Scriptures undoubtedly, as God's word, and found no terms too strong to set forth their heavenly authority; but they understood the Scriptures at the same time

in the sense only of the great outline of doctrine that is contained in the Creed, and considered it heresy to think of forcing them into any other sense. Whatever may be thought of the way in which the symbol came into its present form, on this point no true scholar can have any sort of doubt. From the fifth century back to the second, all doctrine and faith may easily be seen to run in the channel of this scheme and no other. All the other oecumenical symbols include it, with one unvarying voice. All the oecumenical councils recognize it as the only true platform of Christianity, with one and the same witness, echoing from age to age like the sound of many waters. And are we to be told now, by such a man as Dr. Proudfit, that the fathers even of the fourth and fifth centuries, the bishops who sat in the Councils of Nice, and Constantinople, and Ephesus and Chalcedon, knew nothing of the binding authority of this common settled scheme of faith, but held the naked text of the Bible, without the voice of the living Church, to be a sufficient warrant and rule of doctrine for all men, in the exercise simply of their own judgment, and over against the judgment of the whole Christian world; if need be, back to the earliest times—in the pretended style of the Cumberland Presbyterians, Campbellites, Winebrennerians, Baptists and Puritans generally of the present day?

We say *pretended* style; for there is no such thing in truth as this sort of unsymbolical independence in the interpretation of the Bible; and those who promise liberty in this way, only bring in always a real bondage of spirit in the room of the lawful and just authority they dare to set aside. No man reads the Bible without a theological habit of some sort, (even if it be that of a Voltaire or Paine only,) which goes to determine for him the sense of its words. Every sect has its symbol, its tradition, written or unwritten, generally both, for the most part poor, harsh, hard, and dead—under whose iron yoke, is sung the melancholy song of freedom all the day long. Of all conceivable forms of spiritual vassalage, the most dismal surely is to be estranged from the ecumenical faith, the catholic creed, of God's Church as it has stood from the beginning, and to be adopted into the glorious liberty of some paltry sect, which has manufactured a new edition of Christianity for its own use, fresh from the mint of the Bible, in the most approved Puritan style—and now requires you, on pain of sore heresy if not actual perdition, to read the Bible and do up all your religious thinking in this same fashion precisely and no other. For our part, we think it infinitely more safe, as well as vastly more re-

spectable, to take the sense of the inspired volume, with such men as Irenaeus, Cyprian, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Augustine, and the ancient fathers generally, from the standpoint of the old oecumenical councils and creeds, than to sit for the same purpose at the feet of any modern sect whatever, presuming to set up now any new scheme of faith, *not rooted in the Apostles' Creed*, as a better and surer version of what the Scriptures actually mean.

This however by the way. What we wish to press just now is, that the early fathers themselves at all events, along with the universal church in the first ages, could not possibly have dreamed of any such *creed-less* use of the Scriptures, as Dr. Proudfit has laid himself out to fasten upon their theology, turning all history topsy-turvy to carry his prodigious point. The oecumenical symbols ruled their whole faith. It will not do therefore, to quote their authority against themselves, by pretending to set them in opposition to their own age. There are two horns in this whole dilemma. One is, to contend that the modern unchurchly and unsacramental system is the same that prevailed in the beginning. The other is to give this up as a desperate position, and take refuge in the convenient hypothesis of a mystery of iniquity, working from the start and soon carrying all in its own way; in which case, the Apostles' Creed, together with all the oecumenical creeds and councils, must be included in the diabolical apostacy—since the sacramental system clearly underlies the whole scheme of thinking here brought into view. On one or the other of these horns every man must rest, who undertakes to vindicate Protestantism without the idea of historical development, or growth *through the old Catholic Church* into this later system viewed as a higher stage of Christianity—a view that cuts up by the roots the vulgar anti-popery notion of a total triumph of Satan over the Church, (contrary to Christ's promise,) in the middle ages. Neither of the alternatives affords a comfortable resting place. The horns of the dilemma are both sharp. Hence we see a disposition on the part of modern unchurchliness, to make use as much as possible of both; which, as the first is in truth just the contrary of the second, can be done only by hopping inconstantly backwards and forwards from one to the other, or by trying with wide straddle to gain a ticklish harlequin semblance of footing on both at the same time. This will not hold. We must either be true to the one horn or to the other—make the faith and religious life of the early church to be of force for settling the sense of Christianity, or else carry out in earnest the “mystery of iniquity” hypothesis.

The two views cannot stand together. For there is no room to imagine here a distinction of tendencies in the same system, of any such sort as might suit the purposes of this unsacramental school. The whole theology and piety of these first ages are conditioned by the view of the Church that is presented to us in the old oecumenical creeds. All must go together. If we pretend to be on good terms with the fathers, we must not turn their universal creed into a diabolical lie. Antiquity cannot be both true and false here at the same time.

One of the strangest phenomena in the theological world, it seems to us, is the readiness with which, in this whole controversy so many otherwise sensible people gravely pretend to plead for the credit and authority of the Bible, simply because they are bent on having it construed in their own way rather than in that of the ancient church. As though the whole question were not just this in the end, whether the ancient church took not the sense of the Scriptures more truly, than the version for which it is thus proposed to make room! The unsacramental school to which Dr. Proudfit considers it a merit to belong, continually take it for granted that Christian antiquity, wherever it differs from themselves, can not have the Bible on its side, and that it is the easiest thing in the world to correct it now from the plain sense of the sacred volume *as read by this school*. And yet a child may see, what a perfect nose of wax they themselves make the sacred text to be, in accommodation to their own theory. A few doubtful passages, in the face it may be of the whole drift of God's word, are enough to prove for them this or that particular hobby, which they pretend then to pass off as the same thing with the Divine word itself; while the plainest passages against their general system make no impression upon them whatever. When Dr. Proudfit, in the name of this unchurchly school, makes himself and his system the exponent at once of the true sense of the Scriptures, we beg leave to say to him that the pretension is palpably and monstrously false. It would be easy to quote passage upon passage, the simple plain sense of which his whole standpoint must make it impossible for him to receive. The sixth chapter of John, the terms employed in the institution of the Lord's supper, the foundation of the church on Peter, the Apostolical commission, the giving of the keys, and the numerous passages which directly or indirectly ascribe the power of a new birth to baptism, and make the church the organ and vehicle of salvation, may be noticed as instances. All such passages his theological scheme compels him to misinterpret in the most outrageous style. And yet by this same scheme

he undertakes to rule out of court the mind of the ancient church, as though in varying from such arbitrary rule it must of course vary to the same extent also from the Bible!

Our controversy then with Dr. Proudfit, we repeat, as heretofore with the Puritan Recorder and the Baptists, regards the symbolical authority of the Apostles' Creed. Is it still of binding force for the universal church *in its proper historical sense*, the only sure basis of all other symbols, as it was held to be in the beginning; or has it run itself out into an obsolete fiction? That is the question, which brings fully into view the deep solemnity of this whole subject. What nonsense to prate of orthodoxy and heresy by other standards, where the original mould of the Christian faith is thus rudely dashed to pieces! We take no lesson here from any man, who constructs his whining homily on a formal repudiation of all the old oecumenical symbols, with the venerable Apostles' Creed at their head. We say to him rather, in the withering words of the Saviour: "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the *beam* that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye, and behold *a beam is in thine own eye?* Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and *then shalt thou see clearly* to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

J. W. N.

CLOSING NOTICE.

WITH the present number, the *Mercersburg Review* is brought prosperously to the close of its fourth year. As it is felt that its particular mission has been in some sense accomplished, and that it cannot easily be carried forward farther in its past character, it is thought best now to throw the publication into a somewhat different form. It may be expected to appear hereafter, accordingly, in new series, as a *Quarterly*, under some change of title, with more miscellaneous contents, and in more generally popular manner and style. *My own special connection with the work, I wish to have it understood at the same time, is now at an end.* I may write for it occasionally, among other contributors; but I shall be in no way responsible for its editorial management, either directly or indirectly.

Mercersburg, Nov. 10, 1852.

JOHN W. NEVIN.

